FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 154 11 August 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Legislative Bodies Urge Nuclear Test Ban AA 1
Reagan Excludes SDI From Arms Control Talks AA 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Aug]
Biryukov Views U.S. 'Readiness To Abandon SDI' AA 1
Israelyn, U.S. Spokesman Speak on Hiroshima AA 2
[Kuznetsov in IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]
West Lacks 'Political Will' At Geneva Arms Talks AA 3
Pavlov Views Disarmament, Development Relationship AA 4
[PRAVDA 7 Aug]
U.S. Senate Approves Funds for Chemical Weapons AA 6
Reportage on Delhi Six Meeting in Mexico AA 7
Send Messages to Gorbachev, Reagan [Fesenko] AA 7
Conclusion Noted [Shabayev] AA 8

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Moscow TV's 10 Aug 'Studio 9' Program CC 1
[Zorin, Zhurkin, Bovin]
End of NATO Tactical Fighter Exercises Cited CC 11
Commentary Examines Future Role of Imperialism CC 12
[Monin in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Aug]
Ponomarev Views Naval Arms Race, Pacific Security CC 17

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Bovin on U.S. Approach to Summit, Negotiations A 1
Petrovskiy Comments on Relations With U.S. [Budapest TV] A 3
Reagan Continues To Defend 'Star Wars' Program [Yevdokimov] A 8
Ignores West European View [Borin] A 9
Vasilev Decries Cost, Methods of U.S. Stealth Program A 10
[PRAVDA 7 Aug]
Pentagon Maintains Cloak of Secrecy on F-19 Crash [Ustimenko] A 10
U.S. Displeasure With Israel Seen as Propaganda [Krutikhin] A 11

CHINA

KYODO Reports Soviet Nuclear Export Proposal B 1
Director Interviewed as Trade Exhibit Closes B 1
[Savchenko]
Commentary Optimistic on Response to Gorbachev B 2
[Shakov]
'Realistic' Gorbachev Speech Seeks Better Ties B 3
[Mulatov]
CPC Rural Cell Regularization Program Noted B 4
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Aug]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Reportage on Gorbachev Meeting With JCP's Fuwa C 1
Meeting Postponed Twice [KYODO] C 1
Gorbachev 'Resting Due to Cold' [KYODO] C 1
Gorbachev Begins Talks [Tokyo NHK] C 2
Mongolian Statement Welcomes Gorbachev Speech C 2

SOUTH ASIA

TASS Reports on India's Gandhi's Stopover D 1
Shevardnadze, DRA's Dost Discuss Troop Withdrawal D 1
[PRAVDA 11 Aug]
DRA 'Democratization' Process Discussed D 1
[Shurygin in PRAVDA 8 Aug]
BAKHTAR Cited on Actions Against 'Bandits' D 2
[PRAVDA 7 Aug]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Kaysone Phomvihan Arrives for Visit 8 Aug E 1
IZVESTIYA Cites Philippine Views on U.S. Bases E 1
[Kovalev, 8 Aug]
Vladimirov Looks at 'Cobra Gold' Exercise E 2
Konnov Assesses Pacific Antinuclear Conference E 3

WESTERN EUROPE

'Hoodlums' Stage 'Provocation' at Berlin Wall G 1
Demichev Presents Award to Finnish Communist G 1
Petrovskiy Holds Talks With Turkish Delegation G 1
Chikin Delegation Returns From San Marino G 1
[PRAVDA 8 Aug]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

U.S., Israel Hindering Syrian Mideast Role H 1
[Timoshkin]
Sudanese Minister Views Foreign, Domestic Issues H 2
Egypt's Ghali Supports Mideast Initiative H 3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Zambia's Kaunda Praises Gorbachev Proposals J 1
Briefs: Zambian Education Protocol J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Cuban Party Delegation Meets Zaykov, Others K 1
PRAVDA Cites Chilean CP Statement on U.S. Actions K 1
[7 Aug]
Presidium Exchanges Telegrams With Venezuela K 1
[IZVESTIYA 8 Aug]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Action to Recover From Chernobyl Leak Continues R 1
Ryzhkov, Chebrikov Visit Reactor R 1
TV Shows Decontamination Work R 2
Evacuees Get Housing R 6
[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 5 Aug]
Relief Fund Grows R 8
Zaykov Stresses Restructuring in Machine Building R 8
Further Report on Speech R 10
Managers Criticized at Maritime Kraykom Plenum R 11

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Ministries Assailed for Resisting New Methods S 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Aug]

U.S. LEGISLATIVE BODIES URGE NUCLEAR TEST BAN

LD091435 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] Washington August 9 TASS -- As the hearings on the 1987 military spending bill continued in the U.S. Congress, the House of Representatives passed a resolution urging the U.S. President to take a decision on a one-year ban on nuclear explosions with yields of over 1 kiloton starting January 1. Earlier the Senate had passed a resolution urging accession to the moratorium instituted by the Soviet Union. That document had also called upon the administration to start talks on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. Although both resolutions are not binding, they reflect clearly enough the mounting demands in the United States that it join in the Soviet moratorium and conclude a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

REAGAN EXCLUDES SDI FROM ARMS CONTROL TALKS

PM081307 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Aug 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Militarist Course"]

[Text] Washington, 7 Aug -- U.S. President R. Reagan has made another speech defending the "star wars" program. Meeting with representatives of right-wing organizations and military-industrial monopolies, Reagan stated that the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" could not under any circumstances be a subject for arms limitation talks. The United States, he stressed, intends to see through the development of a space-based ABM system and subsequently to deploy it.

In the opinion of observers, Reagan's speech is meant to pressure congressmen, who are currently having stormy debates over the U.S. draft military budget for the next fiscal year. The Senate and House of Representatives are now criticizing the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) increasingly vocally.

The White House's militarist course undermines fundamental arms control documents and makes it impossible to conclude new agreements in this sphere, Senate Edward Kennedy stated. "While President Reagan insists on moving toward deployment of a 'star wars' system," he stated, "the chances of reaching any significant arms control agreement are nil."

The ABM Treaty, Gerard Smith, former head of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, writes in THE NEW YORK TIMES, has restrained an arms race in the sphere of defensive systems for 14 years. But now the administration is proposing to replace this treaty with the "star wars" program, which will lead to an escalation of the arms race.

BIRYUKOV VIEWS U.S. 'READINESS TO ABANDON SDI'

LD082138 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 8 Aug 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Dmitriy Biryukov]

[Text] Over the last few days the U.S. press, television, and radio have, frequently and in different forms, foisted on the public the notion that in his reply to the July letter from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the U.S. President proposed some kind of compromise; that is, that Reagan, it is alleged, showed a readiness to abandon the Strategic Defense Initiative in response to a number of concessions from the USSR.

But, when addressing a group of SDI supporters, mainly belonging to right-wing, conservative organizations, Reagan declared: When the time comes and SDI research is completed, we intend to deploy it. I wish to emphasize that in a number of leading U.S. publications commenting on the U.S. Presidents's reply to the Soviet leader, mention is constantly made of a supposedly expressed readiness to postpone the deployment of the SDI system for 7 years. This is a very cunning statement. During the period indicated, the United States is technically unable to carry out the deployment of such a system. But now, already, while continuing to design and test components of the system, which is banned by the ABM Treaty, they are trying to extract from the Soviet Union an agreement to its deployment in any case.

According to the U.S. press, another part of the U.S. proposals contained in the President's letter has a hidden angle: Here it is a question of eliminating strategic ballistic missiles. The aim of this proposal is transparent enough: to ease the functioning of the U.S. star wars system. After all, they remain silent about the prospects of reducing the numbers of heavy bombers of sea-based long-range cruise missiles.

And, finally, I want to draw attention to the political side of the question: The current U.S. proposals are, unfortunately, not at all constructive. They pose as an effort by Washington to compromise, to take a far-reaching step. It is probably not fortuitous, therefore, that the conservatives, those who attended the meeting I mentioned -- and I want to stress once more that they were representatives of extreme right-wing organizations -- greeted the President's latest proonouncements with a real ovation. They have calmed down, after deciding that no real changes in the position of the Washington administration have, so far at least, taken place.

ISRAELYAN, U.S. SPOKESMAN SPEAK ON HIROSHIMA

PM081453 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Kuznetsov report under the rubric "On Today's Topics" and the general heading "For a World of Peaceful Atoms"]

[Text] Geneva -- The main global problem for mankind in our day is the problem of survival, a problem that is equally acute and urgent for all people, V.L. Israelyan, head of the Soviet delegation, said at a plenary session of the Disarmament Conference.

Our task is, he noted, to discover common denominators in the mosaic of interests and views on the basis of which it would be possible to move the world away from the Hiroshima nightmare, not toward apocalyptic nuclear death, but toward a world free from nuclear weapons, a world of peaceful atoms and peace in space.

It would be good, V.L. Israelyan went on in his speech, if Hiroshima changed from the symbol of atom death into the symbol of peace and cooperation. This would be furthered by the implementation of M.S. Gorbachev's proposal to convene in Hiroshima a Pacific Ocean conference on the Helsinki model with the participation of countries oriented toward that ocean. The Soviet representative also expounded in detail the USSR's position on the question of preventing an arms race in outer space, which is being examined at the conference.

This position on the part of the Soviet Union was supported by other delegates in their speeches, in which they stressed that the political lessons of Hirsohima demanded active diplomacy in favor of peace and that in the atomic age you cannot think in the old terms, since in a nuclear war there can be no winner.

The speech by the head of the American delegation at the conference was sharply dissonant. He tried to shift responsibility from the U.S. military for the atom bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, saying that it is time to forget about this, because, as he hypocritically stated, "friendship has grown and is flourishing between yesterday's enemies." This cynical attitude to the senseless sacrifices of the nuclear bombings aroused a protest, in particular, from the International League of Women for Peace and Freedom. Fourteen members of a delegation present at the U.S. ambassador's speech stated that they condemn the American representative's irresponsible position.

WEST LACKS 'POLITICAL WILL' AT GENEVA ARMS TALKS

LD100924 Moscow TASS in English 0914 GMT 10 Aug 86

[Text] Geneva August 10 TASS -- Intermediate results are being summed up at the Conference on Disarmament, whose special bodies are concluding their work.

The most attention is paid to the state of affairs in the special committee for the ban on chemical arms. Practical negotiations aimed at drawing up an appropriate international agreement are under way in that working body. The overwhelming majority of the delegations express the opinion that the progress made in the work of the special committee during this part of the session of 1986, has been largely predetermined by the Soviet Union's initiatives submitted for the conference's consideration on April 22. These proposals ensured progress on a number of problems that had earlier seemed to be deadlocked. The proposals established new directions on which initial material at research level has been accumulated. This material might become the basis for agreeing upon and, subsequently, wording the parts of the draft convention.

There is no doubt, however, that greater progress could have been achieved if it were not for a contradictory stand of Western countries on a number of key problems, including such an important problem as keeping from production of lethal chemicals in the commercial industry.

Even though almost all delegations mentioned as priority aim the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and even though there exists a great number of proposals setting out in detail the attitudes of states, for instance, the USSR, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Pakistan, China, and Australia, the special committee failed to embark on a concrete discussion of this matter, the discussion aimed at working out an appropriate interntional agreement or agreements. The only reason for this failure is the lack of political will of the delegations of the United States and other Western countries.

During the session, representatives of various delegations stressed more than once that stagnation at the talks on such priority matters as safe development of nuclear power and a ban on radiological weapons cannot be regarded normal. The work of the special committee must be switched to practical lines, the more so since there is a substantial basis for this: the Soviet proposals set out in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of May 12.

The question of working out an all-embracing programme of disarmament has been on the agenda of the conference over many years. But even at the 1986 session, the participants, meeting in the appropriate special committee, have been unable to remove the main obstacle: the striving of delegations of western countries to prepare a register of the agreed upon statements, and not a truly all-embracing document that would suggest practical measures in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament.

PAVLOV VIEWS DISARMAMENT, DEVELOPMENT RELATIONSHIP

PM080807 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[A. Pavlov article: "Indissoluble Link: How Disarmament Could Accelerate Mankind's Socioeconomic Development"]

[Text] It is absolutely clear today that the arms race, which swallows up colossal resources, is one of the main barriers in the path of mankind's socioeconomic development. It does tremendous damage to international economic cooperation, scientific and technical ties, and world trade. In 1985, for instance, more than $800 billion, according to some estimates, was spent worldwide on arms production and the maintenance of military personnel. Total world expenditure on military scientific research in the same year amounted to approximately one-fourth of all spending on scientific research and development. The annual U.S. military budget now exceeds $300(!) billion. This is at a time when more than 400 million people in the developing countries regularly go short of food, 50 million die of starvation every year, 100 million children are in danger of starving to death, and 30 percent of children have no chance of an education.

The unproductive waste of resources on arms has a great deal to do with the developing countries' huge debt, which has now reached nearly a trillion dollars. The CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th congress pointed directly to the definite casual relationship between those countries' debt of a trillion dollars and the increase of more than a trillion dollars in U.S. military spending in the last decade. The disastrous economic position of the young liberated countries and the intensification of the imperialist powers' and monopolies' exploitation of them is one reason for international tension and conflicts in various parts of the globe.

Speaking of the processes taking place, for instance, in the countries of the vast Asian region, M.S. Gorbachev noted in his Vladivostok speech: "These states have tens and hundreds of problems that cry out for attention, some inherited from the colonial past and some rising from the contradictions of current development. Yet they are drawn into blocs, their freedom to dispose of their own resources is restricted, they are forced to increase their military budgets, and they are dragged into the arms race and the militarization of the economy and public life.

"All this distorts the processes of internal development, creates tension, and, of course, hampers the normalization of internation and interstate relations."

It is quite natural that many governments, in particular those of developing countries, as well as progressive circles and international socioeconomic and political organizations, are increasingly raising questions of the economic and social consequences of the arms race in the modern world, as well as the potential inherent in disarmament for accelerating the development of all states, in particular the young liberated states. In this context the broad world public attached great significance to the international conference, which was scheduled to be held in Paris in late July and early August of this year, on questions of the relationship between disarmament and development; The 40th UN General Assembly Session adopted the decision to hold this conference.

The conference was set the task of examining a wide range of questions connected with the negative effect of the arms race and military spending on economic and social development, as well as ways and means of releasing additional resources for development purposes as a result of disarmament measures. During preparations for the conference the proximity or identity of the positions of socialist and nonaligned countries on these questions became increasingly clear.

The nonaligned countries came out actively in favor of convening the conference. The political declaration of the Coordinating Bureau of the Nonaligned Movement, adopted at the session in Delhi in April 1986, the foreign ministers of the participating states welcomed the UN General Assembly's decision to hold such an international conference and called upon all states to participate at the highest level, in order to draw up concrete recommendations.

At the sessions of the preparatory committee in New York, many nonaligned countries drew attention to the paramount significance of measures in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. They also proposed setting up a fund into which resources secured through reducing military expenditure would be paid.

At the same time the speeches of representatives of certain developing countries demonstrated some inconsistency: Some of them came out in favor of handing resources over to the developing states even before the implementation of any real measures in the disarmament sphere, by means of establishing a system for allocating resources to the developing countries by way of a type of "tax" on military spending. This approach could hardly be deemed rational, since under this "taxation" system the young liberated states would have an objective interest in the maximum increase in the military budgets of those states that are militarily most powerful.

From the outset the United States took a negative line on the conference. Representatives of the Washington administration clearly feared that this forum would inevitably be sharply critical of the White House's course of further spurring on the arms race and of its opposition to disarmament measures. That is undoubtedly why, in April, the United States officially announced its refusal to take part in the conference.

As a result of American pressure the Western countries' delegations toughened their position and displayed clear reluctance to work on drawing up an agreed draft final document for the conference. This emerged clearly at the preparatory committee session held in June 1986.

The leading NATO states began to pursue a line not allowing any restrictions on the increase in military budgets; to suppress criticism of their efforts to launch an arms race; and to assert that disarmament will not yield direct, immediate benefits for development. It is noteworthy that representatives of the Western powers, even during the work of the preparatory committee, were coming out against any proposals on handing over to the developing countries some of the resources that could be released as a result of arms reduction and disarmament measures. In particular, a thesis was put forward on the "lack of a direct relationship" between disarmament and development, claiming that questions of disarmament and development must be resolved in parallel, independently of each other.

Of course, behind all this there is nothing less than the desire, in effect, to stall and frustrate the work to prepare for the conference on questions of the relationship between disarmament and development.

It was evidently not without the influence of the NATO partners that France, which had formerly proposed convening the conference in Paris, in May of this year proposed postponing it until 1987, without specifying a date.

Nonetheless, despite the pressure from Western countries and their attempts to postpone the conference to an unspecified date (or rather, to prevent its convocation), at its June session the preparatory committee came out in favor of holding this important forum in 1987. Concrete dates will be determined by a decision of the 41st UN General Assembly Session this fall.

As for the Soviet Union, the relationship between disarmament and development is indicated in the fundamentals for the creation of an all-embracing international security system formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress. They provide for the elaboration of principles for utilizing for the good of the world community, and particularly of the developing countries, some of the resources that will be released because of the reduction of military budgets.

The Soviet Union has come out and continues to come out actively in favor of holding an international conference on questions of the relationship between disarmament and development. In the USSR's opinion the conference's main task should be to examine constructively the question of ways of releasing additional resources for the purposes of development as a result of practical arms limitation measures. This line is supported by the other Warsaw Pact states. As the communique of the Budapest Political Consultative Committee conference noted, they "attach great significance to the holding of an international conference on disarmament and development in line with the UN decision." The Soviet Union and the other socialist states are doing which work in socioeconomic bodies and specialized institutions within the UN system in order to involve them in preparing for this international conference and on a wider plane in promoting the cause of disarmament and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war.

At the preparatory committee session held in New York in June, the USSR reaffirmed its support for the desision to convene a conference with the participation of all states. It declared its readiness to take part in the forum regardless of the attitude of any other countries. It is a matter of conviction: The conference will help to replace the principle of "arms, not development," imposed by militarism, with a different order of things -- "disarmament for development."

U.S. SENATE APPROVES FUNDS FOR CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD081825 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 8 Aug 86

["Plans To Impose Chemical Weapons on Europe" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Washington August 8 TASS -- The U.S. Senate has rejected by 57 votes, against 43, an amendment stipulating for the NATO country's consent for the beginning of production in the USA of a new type of chemical weapons -- binary ammunition. Concurrently, the Senate turned down by 51 votes against 50 an amendment to nullify funds for the production of the Bigeye chemical binary bomb in the 1987 fiscal year budget.

The White House urgently sent U.S. Vice President George Bush to the Capitol Hill before the vote which pulled through the Senate the decision on allocation of money for chemical weapons. The vice-president, acting as the Senate's presiding officer, broke the 50-50 tie.

The vote at the Senate, with the majority of votes held by the Republican Party, patently illustrated that in Washington they do not intend to spend the money in vain and delay with implementation of the U.S. dangerous "chemical rearmament" plans. And the main thing is that they are not going to consult on that question with their close allies in the North Atlantic bloc. Meanwhile, from the U.S. President's recent message to Congress on the problem of chemical armaments, the conclusion could be made that the administration has already met all the terms set by the Congress for launching the production of binary weapons. The President alleged that the NATO member countries approved the plans of deploying binary weapons on their territory.

But such assertions are at variance with reality. Since the NATO defence minister only "took into consideration" the U.S. plans; and this by no means testifies to their consent to grant their territory for stockpiling a new generation of chemical weapons.

REPORTAGE ON DELHI SIX MEETING IN MEXICO

Send Messages to Gorbachev, Reagan

LD080923 Moscow TASS in English 0743 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] Ixtapa (Mexico) August 8 TASS -- TASS correspondent Valeriy Fesenko reports:

The leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden have urged the USSR to extend the Soviet moratorium, and the USA that it give up nuclear testing before the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting. Addressing newsmen, the heads of state and government of the "Delhi Six" said that they had sent messages containing these proposals to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. As is pointed out in the "Mexican Declaration" adopted by them, an immediate termination of nuclear blasts is the necessary step towards reaching an agreement to ban any nuclear weapons tests. It is necessary, the declaration says, that first at least the United States join in the nuclear moratorium announced by one of the nuclear powers.

Nuclear disarmament and, in the long run, the total elimination of the nuclear arsenals, is manking's top priority objective, the declaration said. The leaders of the six have warned against the danger of a militarisation of outer space. Creation of space weapons, they emphasized, would lead to an irreversible escalation of the arms race and destroy every opportunity to reach agreement. The declaration stresses the pressing need for putting an end to the perfection of anti-satellite weapons in order to facilitate the conclusion of an international treaty on their prohibition.

The participants in the meeting also offer their countries' assistance in veryfying a nuclear test ban. These measures could help towards buildings up confidence between the USSR and the USA and mark a step forward towards creating a control system to ensure abidance by the nuclear test ban treaty.

The leaders of the "Delhi Six" have welcomed the USSR's constructive stand on the issue of ending nuclear testing. This stand is praiseworthy and we are deeply grateful for it to the USSR Government, Rajiv Gandhi told newsmen.

Regrettably, Andreas Papandreou pointed out, only one of the sides -- the USSR has so far given a positive response to the appeal by the "Delhi Six" for an end to nuclear testing. On his part, Julius Nyerere expressed regret over the fact the the U.S. Administration, on whose actions progres in the field of nuclear disarmament depends in a considerable measure, is passing over the soviet peace initiatives in silence. Therefore, he said, it is important that the American people should wake up to the realization of the true scope or the threat hanging over the whole mankind. The leaders of the six countries, who repeatedly pointed out that their efforts are centered in the first place on assisting towards resolution of the most important task, ensuring peace and disarmament, and pointed out the disastrous consequences of the arms race for the developing nations. An end to the arms race, above all of nuclear arms, President De la Madrid of Mexico said among others things, would make it possible to release enormous funds in order to be able to resolve the foreign debt problem of many countries.

Conclusion Noted

LD082222 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

A regular meeting of the 'Delhi Six' -- the leaders of Argentina, India, Greece, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania -- has ended in the small Mexican town of Ixtapa. Slightly more than two years have passed since the leaders of these countries appealed to the leaders of the nuclear powers to ban the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapon systems and their delivery vehicles.

The peace initiatives by these authoritative leaders who represent a considerable part of mankind, and their readiness practically to promote an end to nuclear tests, has always found full understanding and support in the Soviet Union. Washington, however, up to now does not pay heed to the voice of reason. This necessitated the holding of a new meeting of 'the six', timed for the 41st anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

When opening the meeting, President Miguel De la Madrid of Mexico emphasised that the threat posed by nuclear weapons to the very existence of mankind should be countered by a still more powerful weapon -- the will of millions of people for peace and for the preservation of life on earth. This will was shown by the participants in the Mexican meeting.

They adopted a declaration pointing out that nuclear disarmament and, ultimately, complete elimination of nuclear arsenals is the first priority goal of mankind. Immediate cessation of all nuclear tests should become the major and indispensable first step in this direction.

The leaders of 'the six' again draw attention to the extreme danger of the space militarisation plans, emphasising that the development of space weapons would lead to an irreversible escalation of the arms race and would nullify any possibility of reaching agreement on a ban on nuclear tests. Speakers at the Mexican meeting expressed deep gratitude to the Soviet Union which is firmly resolved to continue to press for a solution to the acute problem of completely banning nuclear tests, the problem which brooks no delay.

To our great regret, Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou of Greece pointed out, a different stand is held by the U.S. Administration which does not give a positive reply to the appeals of the 'Delhi Six' and ignores the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union. In these conditions, stated Julius Nyerere, representative of Tanzania, the task of awakening in the United States the realisation of the true scope of the danger which hangs over mankind and of responsibility for mankind's future is taking on a paramount importance.

A call to do everything possible to prevent a recurrence of the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was conveyed in messages addressed to the participants in the Ixtapa meeting by the mayors of these Japanese cities which had been the first victims of nuclear recklessness. Time should not be lost, they write, for tomorrow it could be late.

When reading these messages one cannot but recall Antoine de Saint-Exupery, a great humanist, French air pilot and writer whose life had been severed in the battle against fascism, for a peaceful and free future of mankind. His behest to people was that in order to get saved one should make a step. Nowadays such a step -- immediately to end any nuclear explosions -- is essential as never before. It is up to Washington.

MOSCOW TV'S 10 AUG 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW100935 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0532 GMT 10 Aug 86

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet Television and Radio, with Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer]

[Text] Hello comrades, we are meeting you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center to discuss topical problems in world politics. Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer, are taking part in our discussion today. We will devote our discussion today to somewhat unusual events now taking place in the U.S. capital.

Generally, at this time of year, during the hot summer, there is a political lull in the U.S. capital. However, events are now occuring there which I would call unusual, and even extraodinary. They are connected with the letter U.S. President Ronald Reagan sent to Moscow to the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary. You know that at the end of June, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sent Reagan a letter containing very important new Soviet proposals concerning the problem of disarmament and dealing with Soviet-U.S. relations.

Washington's reaction to this letter was not a traditional one. There was no outright rejection of the letter's contents, and the President said that it was a matter of very important and serious proposals made by the Soviet Union. Then, Washington spent more than a month preparing a reply to Mikhail Sergeyevich's letter. At the end of July, the White House sent a letter to Moscow. According to existing protocol and existing traditions, this kind of correspondence between state leaders is generally of a confidential nature and is not intended for wide discussion in the press. Nevertheless, this time Washington patently and crudely violated this unwritten law, this principle, and violated its confidentiality. The U.S. press started, fairly widely, to discuss Reagan's letter. Besides, there was a patent leak, as it is called in the United States, of information. Political journalists and press organizations received certain reports from appropriately informed circles. Wide discussion of the letter's contents, and interpretations of the President's reply, and so forth, followed.

It is known that the Soviet Union has not yet replied to Reagan's letter. Mikhail Sergeyevich, speaking in Vladivostok, said that this document is being studied. Meanwhile, there is this propaganda ballyhoo going on in the United States. I think that these circumstances free our hands to some extent; and since we are not officials, not occupying official posts in the state apparatus, I think we are justified in using what we know from reports...

[Bovin interrupts] All the more so since there are also rumors in Moscow, not only in Washington.

[Zorin] Yes, and using what we have learned from reports in the U.S. press and from what is being discussed in Moscow we will deal today with this topic. Before we discuss this matter, I would like to ask you, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, these questions: What is the matter? Why has there been a violation of the usual rules? Why has there been a leak? What is behind all this your view?

[Bovin] First of all, Valentin Sergeyevich, I would not emphasize the violation of rules because you know perfectly well that they keep nothing secret there and they always organize all kinds of leaks.

[Zorin interrupts] Often, but not always. When needed, they know how to keep silent.

[Bovin] Yes, but this is a special case by the nature of the importance of the topic itself. The United States is now in a fairly difficult position because lately -- and our viewers know this -- there have been systematic peace initiatives by the Soviet Union, the extended moratorium, goodwill gestures, and a whole series of proposals. All this has placed the White House in a difficult position because, by saying no every time, and then no again, and no again, it has produced a negative reaction in the world public opinion and also in the United States. And now, Reagan's letter on the essence of the matter and this campaign around this letter I would say are an attempt to intensify political maneuvering and generally seize the initiative. This is actually what the aim is: to seize the initiative and calm Americans by using an optimistic tone. The letter has been written, everything is normal, everything is okay, it meets the Russians' wishes, and opens the door for a summit meeting, so everything is normal. As Reagan said: The ball is now in the Soviet court and it is Moscow's turn to reply.

And that is all. So the essence of the matter is to seize the initiative and say: We have done our work and now it is the Russians' turn. I think that this is the purport of all the talk going on there.

[Zorin] The U.S. press presents the contents of Reagan's letter to Moscow as very important and as opening new roads in the Soviet-U.S. talks. Vitaliy Vladimirovich what could you say on this subject and what is the essence of the U.S. position, on the basis of what has been published in the U.S. press in particular, and what we know?

[Zhurkin] Valentin Sergeyevich, I would begin by saying that it is necessary to try to examine this position very carefully, without any preconceived ideas. If there are elements of logic in it, on no account should they be overlooked. It should be approached in a very objective manner since the matter is of exceptional importance. Most probably, it is best, when speaking about the U.S. position, to compare it on a purely factual basis with the Soviet position, the way it appears, the way it is today.

The key issue is preventing the arms race in space, and, if we talk about the United States, it is the SDI issue, the fate of SDI.

The Soviet position, which has been fairly accurately outlined to the United States, is as follows: not abandoning the ABM treaty, the timeless treaty which was signed in 1972, for a 15-year period. What does Reagan offer: not abandoning this treaty over a period of 7 to 7 and 1/2 years and carrying out not only research but also experimental design work and even testing space weapons. He proposes that at the end of this period the sides begin talks on how they will deploy space arms, how they will conduct the militarization of space.

With respect to strategic arms, strategic intercontinental arms, the Soviet Union has taken very major steps. We have proposed an interim solution of this problem, an interim decision which would cover three classes of existing strategic arms -- intercontinental, submarine-based, and heavy bomber-based ballistic missiles.

Insofar as Soviet-U.S. talks are concerned, the counting generally begins at the figure which was fixed, in its time, in the SALT II treaty, which is 2,400 vehicles. The Soviet Union has proposed in the interim, a solution as a first step, to reduce, by approximately one-third, the number of vehicles and the number of warheads. Speaking in concrete terms this means 1,600 vehicles and 8,000 warheads. We are talking about a comprehensive solution which would leave no loopholes.

In the field of intermediate range weapons, the Soviet Union has taken an important compromise step. It proposed to take these weapons out of categories and to discuss them separately.

What does Reagan offer? On the basis of all these leaks and the information at our disposal, he offered to reduce arms by half, but actually just one class, or more precisely, two classes -- warheads on land-based and sea-based missiles. That is all.

The third and most important element of this entire system are intermediate-range weapons and primarily intermediate-range missiles. Here too, the Soviet Union has taken a step forward. The Soveit Union in Geneva openly proposed a draft agreement with the United States on the elimination, destruction, and dismantling of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe; on freezing the level of Soviet missiles -- in Asia.

There have been major arguments about the British and French missile forces. The USSR has offered to take them out of negoatiations, provided the British and French forces remain at their present level.

What does Reagan offer? Here Reagan has essentially simply repeated the U.S. position which has been outlined many times: The so-called U.S. zero option which has been made repeatedly, or the interim decision, the core of which is that a certain number of U.S. missiles as many as possible, remains in Europe.

[Zorin] When the U.S. press outlines the President's position, it does so mostly with question marks.

Let us examine the essence of these proposals without any emotion, calmly and objectively. Let us begin with the important problem of the ABM treaty, please, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich.

[Bovin] Well, without emotions -- generally the Americans have a lot of emotions, and there is one emotion here. They say that Reagan's letter contains a fundamentally new approach. In the past, Reagan generally said that SDI was not a subject for discussion, and now, for the first time, the President has agreed to discuss some aspects of his very own "star wars" program.

[Zorin interrupts] On the surface this is effective.

[Bovin] Yes, and in fact, people in the United States even more right-wing, even more conservative than Reagan are literally sounding the alarm and clamoring about what is going on, that Reagan is retreating from his positions, that liberals of some sort have convinced him, you see, and that the United States is being disarmed, so to speak, in the face of the Russians. This is the sort of clamor you hear.

[Zorin] But in actual fact?

[Bovin] In actual fact, of course, there is no basis for this clamor because, well, just look at what Reagan proposes. Now we have told the United States, as we have noted already, let us adhere to the ABM treaty for 15-20 years and refrain from deploying these systems. Reagan says, good, for 5 years we agree not to deploy these space-based defense systems.

But what is 5 years? Even if he said nothing and proposed nothing, according to their own plans, deployment of these space ABM systems can begin somewhere in the middle of the nineties, at the earliest. They give themselves 10 years. Yet Reagan proposes 5 years. Very well, we will not deploy them for 5 years, he says, and then we will hold talks with you for 2 years. Talks about what? Talks about how to gradually move into a new era, an era oriented towards defense systems. In other words, talks about how to deploy these systems in space. And if we fail to reach any agreement during these 2 years then either of the two sides will have the right to begin deploying these systems after giving the other side 6-months notice.

This is Reagan's logic. Now generally I think, comrades, that you all understand, in fact, that Reagan demands that we sanction ourselves, and that we sign an agreement with him permitting U.S. deployment of these systems. But this is a matter of principle. In fact, this is what we are struggling against. Yet he proposes that we change our position 180 degrees, and contrary to our position, recognize the necessity of these systems. This, strictly speaking, is the first element of Reagan's position, if we speak objectively, and what it means in essence is...

[Zhurkin, interrupts] But to this...

[Bovin] A complete surrender by the Soviet Union, a retreat from our positions and adoption of U.S. positions. That is all.

[Zhurkin] To this can be added other positions, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, that must also be calmly reviewed. They propose not only that laboratory research be carried out, but that experimental designs and tests be legalized.

[Bovin] Field tests, not bench tests.

[Zhurkin] Yes, field tests, normal field tests. Now this is a revision of the ABM Treaty. How can preservation of the ABM Treaty be discussed when Article 5 simply prohibits this.

Now, very briefly, I would like to say something about another element of the U.S. position. It proposes the establishment of a regime which will not deploy mass destruction weapons in space as something new.

[Bovin] There is a treaty on this topic.

[Zhurkin] There is a treaty. I especially brought a text of this treaty which was signed. [changes thought] The 20th anniversary of its signing will be marked next January, and it says -- it was also signed by the United States -- that the signatory states of the treaty will not launch or deploy weapons of mass destruction in space. Talk should now concentrate on not launching any weapons into space that could operate against the earth from space. This is understandable.

Obviously another maneuver is set down in Reagan's response...

[Bovin, interrupts] They are continuing to stick to their line, that is the essence of the matter. Instead of seeking a compromise and taking stock they are pursuing their line.

[Zhurkin] Yes, they stick to their line.

[Zorin] Generally the impression is created that we are talking about a trick. They talk about 5 years for the ABM Treaty while the head of the U.S. program says that they will not be ready for at least 9-10 years. So it simply appears that this 5 years is a fairly unseemly trick.

Another key issue in Soviet-U.S. talks is the question of strategic arms. Now if we proceed from the information that we have, which has come into our hands, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, is there anything new in this issue, in the proposals contained in Reagan's letter?

[Bovin] You know, one must take into consideration that the U.S. position has now changed fundamentally. If previously, it remained within the framework of the restrictions stipulated by SALT I and SALT II, grudgingly maybe, in May, Reagan practically wiped this whole matter out by saying that the administration would not be guided by these restrictions, and proposed to substitute the existing regime by... [changes thought] They had various formulas: for example, they called it a substitute regime [rezhim zamenitel] or called it a new arms control structure, or even used the term interim framework for genuine mutual restraint, instead of this regime.

Now what does this mean? How do they picture this restraint? They say, good, we will develop our armed forces but we will not have more warheads than you have on strategic missiles. This is our restraint. Very well, some 15 years ago this really would have meant restraint on their part, but now, when there are cruise missiles, say, on heavy bombers -- and they are arming their aircraft, their machines with cruise missiles in the most active way -- and when there are sea-based long-range missiles, to simply limit one's restraint to stategic missiles is just impossible. There is no reciprocity.

No matter where you turn when your review the letter, even in the most objective way, their position is essentially the same -- agreement on their terms. Of course, now you say it is a trick. But from Reagan's point of view it is not a trick. He is defending the interests of the United States as he understands them, completely forgetting that, insofar as some kind of agreement is under discussion, he should also take our interests into consideration. For some reason, the Americans forget this and here it is manifested quite well, I mean in the sphere of strategic arms.

[Zorin] Yes, but from the point of view of bilateral relations this really does look like a trick.

[Zhurkin] It looks like a trick for another reason too. If we were to summarize what Reagan omits from the proposal on strategic arms, we would see omitted all those forces in which the United states has forged further ahead.

[Bovin] Yes, the cruise missiles.

[Zhurkin] Take the cruise missiles. They began deploying them first.

They have deployed somewhere in the vicinity of 1,500 to 2,000 of them according to various sources. Now take bombers. Their effectiveness increases sharply when armed with cruise missiles; they want to omit them and leave.

[Zorin interrupts] We are talking about...

[Zhurkin interrupts] and leave a loop hole to continue the arms race.

[Zorin] We are talking about our side limiting what we have more of while they retain what they have more of.

[Zhurkin] Yes, retain what they have more of.

[Zorin] We have assessed our point of view on these proposals. The official position has not been announced yet, but we have expressed our opinion. Now I would like to dwell on another aspect related to President Reagan's letter which is presently the cause of so much clamour.

The U.S. press believes this letter was a kind of compromise between various opposing Washington groups. There are doves and there are hawks there. When Comrade Gorbachev's letter was received, the hawks insisted that everything be rejected outright. The doves suggested it be viewed seriously. Reagan's response is a compromise between the two opposing Washington opinions. Vitaliy Vladimirovich, does this appear to be true?

[Zhurkin] Valentin Sergeyevich, that is how it appears to me. I think that in dealing with the Reagan administration we are not dealing with a monolith but with an administration in which there is a struggle between various trends. This struggle may not be as simple as it is described by the U.S. press. They make everything appear quite simple. Shultz is on the left, Weinberger is on the right; Shultz supports a constructive course of developments, Weinberger supports a negative one.

Not everything is so simple, because we are talking about a struggle between various forces, although the entire complex is positioned to the right. But the one and the other understand that ultimately it could be curtains for all [v sluchaye chego pokhorony stanut vseobshchimi]. From this they conclude that relations must be put in order somehow, they must be regulated, gaining the utmost advantage for themselves, while others continue to build hopes of achieving supremacy.

[Zorin] Vitaliy Vladimirovich, excuse me, but I will probably disagree with you on some things. It seems to me that the differences in the administration between Weinberger and Shultz, are being grossly exaggerated. I think that there is a great element of political play in this, a game calculated at deceiving the world, and primarily U.S. public opinion. Of course, there are different opinions between different people in the administration, but on basic issues they, nevertheless, occupy a fairly monolithic position.

The main thing in this is that the decisive role is not played by various advisers who come to Reagan with their advice, but is played by the President himself. Of course, one must say that presently the Presidency is at an odd point. Nearly 6 years of Reagan's term have passed and little more than 2 years remain. In U.S. political jargon this is termed lame duck. When the President's term is drawing to a conclusion and politicians are looking to see who the next boss will be, the President's influence is considered to be waning.

However, an extremely curious thing is happening now. You know that the question of nominating Reagan for election to a third term is now being discussed. A corresponding bill has even been submitted to Congress. This is a very complex matter. The 22d Amendment to the Constitution must be repealed and I personally think that this is simply unrealizable. To repeal a constitutional amendment, or to adopt one, for that matter, is an extremely cumbersome procedure, requiring a long period of time, and the 2-odd years remaining for Reagan will not be enough.

Why, then, have they done this? Now this relates precisely to what we have been talking about -- to avoid making Reagan a lame duck, to strengthen his political influence, and to exert a political and psychological pressure on the elite. In other words, do not think that Reagan is on the way out. It is possible he will be elected for the third time. Hence his influence is bolstered. Either way, one way or the other, it remains a fact that despite some controversy in Washington, decisions there and their implementation continue to remain in the White House, in the hands of the President.

[Zhurkin] Well Valentin Sergeyevich, let us register our differences then, so to speak, because...

[Bovin, interrupts] I wanted to support you [tebya] in this case. [gestures toward Zhurkin]

[Zhurkin] Yes.

[Bovin] I cannot agree that this is a political game. I think it is very serious and it is not only a matter of differences within the Reagan administration, I look more deeply. If you take the U.S. ruling class now and not just the administration, you find, in the ruling class, various U.S. bourgeoisie and U.S. ruling groups with different political positions.

[Zorin, interrupts] Here I agree with you, that is correct.

[Bovin] And that is reflected to a certain extent by actions in the systems.

[Zorin, interrupts] And the extent to which it is reflected in the system is a debatable question.

[Bovin] It may be so. Look at the Congress for instance: You cannot say that it is no longer subordinate to the White House, but clearly it takes a different position with respect to the Republic of South Africa, the position on nuclear testing, the position of defense spending. Generally, congressmen oppose the White House's position on very important and fundamental issues. And I do not know what will happen after the elections that will be held this year. They may intensify precisely these accents. These differences occurring in the broader social strata of the ruling elite are reflected in White House policy. Of course, Reagan is maneuvering: He has to take into consideration this and that and the other...

[Zhurkin, interrupts] And the game, there are also elements of the game.

[Bovin] There are, of course. But the game is not the main thing in politics, it is just an arrangement. And he must take all this into consideration. And indeed this letter does that probably... [changes thought] Judging from the rumors going around, some things were excluded from it, somebody objected, somebody argued, something was excluded. It is not in vain that they were engaged with this matter for a whole month.

[Zhurkin] Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, the letter can also be the result of compromise but the result is not a good quality one, the result turned out substandard [brakvannyy].

[Bovin] That is another matter. If you wish I can even defend the Americans, in a way, because they are in a special situation. In addition to holding talks with us, they are also holding talks among themselves, and also [words indistinct]...

[Khurkin, interrupts] [Words indistinct] talks

[Bovin] Yes, and in this respect...

[Zorin, interrupts] And the factor of the allies.

[Bovin] Yes, and the allies too. They cannot overlook the position of the allies because the value of detente is felt much more in Europe. In Europe they are more serious about restoring detente and somehow normalizing the entire situation which has now emerged, and they put pressure on the Americans. You most probably remember, comrades, the recent "Studio 9" program in which Egon Bahr and David Owen participated. It was very obvious that their position was different from that of the Americans. And this is not some particular case. It is generally so, despite the fact that Western Europe kowtows to the United States, that is understandable. That is because of Atlantic solidarity, discipline. Yet there are other political positions and this has to be registered somehow and cannot be ignored by the White House. This is also reflected in the Americans' position.

[Zorin] In order to summarize the results of this part of our discussion I would like to say that it is indisputable that there are serious differences in the U.S. ruling class and that there are influential circles which are increasingly more concerned. It is indisputable that this is also reflected in the position of the Congress, which is confronting the administration more and more. It is indisputable that the allies are raising their voices more and more, and objecting sometimes openly and more often secretly to the Washington line. But I retain my view that as far as the administration is concerned, it is fairly monolithic and is following its line, which was particularly reflected in this letter, because even from what you two colleagues have said in characterizing the letter, no contradictions or special compromise ensure. What ensures is a firm line repeating practically most of what the Americans have said so far. And now I would like to deal with a very important issue which, possibly in the ballyhoo of the last few days, about which we are talking and because of which we were forced [vynuzhdeny] to appear today, occupies a leading place. Everything is connected with prospects for a summit meeting, prospects outlined during the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbavhev and President Reagan. Now the letter addressed by Reagan to Moscow is being interpreted as if it opens the road to this meeting, and removes obstacles that there could have been. And thus the American side has done everything to make a summit meeting possible. Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, what would you say in this connection?

[Bovin] I do not have that impression at all because what does the door mean? It means to create some conditions for solving at least a few concrete issues at this meeting. If it is a question of holding another ritual, no conditions at all are needed. They meet, talk, it is televised, there is a ceremony, and they part.

It is an empty letter from this point of view. I may be wrong, I may be underestimating some things that I do not know. But in the U.S. newspaper "BOSTON GLOBE, a journalist wrote the following -- I just want to read it, comrades, I think it is said very correctly: Yes, President Reagan wants the summit meeting to take place. He wants to appear like a competent state leader. But the important fact which the United States must realize is that the only result Reagan wants to achieve during the summit meeting is to induce the Russians to ratify the havoc he has wreaked on the entire system of agreed military limitations.

I think that this describes very accurately the essence of the matter. Namely, Reagan wants Comrade Gorbavhev to come and agree with the U.S. approach to all the fundamental positions. It is clear that this cannot happen. Hence, returning to the letter, I do not see it creating some new favorable conditions for a second summit meeting.

[Zhurkin] All the same, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, we have the eternal question. Is the glass half full or half empty? All the same, it seems to me that today's Reagan is not the 1980-81 model. Let us remember his bravado in 1980 and 1981, let us remember Reagan's arrogant attitude toward the very idea of a summit meeting. And now he is almost seeking and asking for a meeting. Of course this is not being done out of sympathy for us nor because of a thirst for peace. This is being done apparently because of political interests...

[Bovin interrupts] An interest in what?

[Zhurkin] And we must try to evaluate the intensity of these interests.

[Bovin interrupts] In what? In just prattling or in solving something? That is the problem. An interest in what: in solving concrete political problems or in just shaking Gorbachev's hand once again, but in Washington this time? That is their problem.

[Zhurkin] I think that the factors are pressuring him. I could enumerate them. But the President and the administration are opposing this pressure and are trying to deal with these factors in order to hold the meeting on their terms, to ensure their conditions. Nevertheless, the factors are pressing on, and here it is impossible to assess whether these factors will press hard enough on the Reagan administration for it to do something more constructive or not. The future will show. It is difficult to evaluate these factors today. There is a large number of very major factors. You have already said that Reagan is threatened with entering history as the first President in many years who has failed to agree with the Russians on arms limitations. This cannot fail to worry the administration however conservative its views.

The many difficulties with Congress are obvious. We have talked about that. Here is another fact: The Americans were actually promised military superiority over the Soviet Union. A trillion dollars were spent, but there is no superiority at all. And this has to be considered by the administration. For this reason, I would say, and this is my view, that there has been no strategic change in the Reagan administration. The same people and the same policy are there as before. Yet there have been small tactical turns in the administration. There is no doubt about the aspiration to use these tactical turns for its own advantage.

[Bovin] Yes, I agree that it is possible to talk about some tactical turns.

Nevertheless, what does coming to an agreement mean? Coming to agreement implies some kind of compromise; I have to give in on something, you have to give in somewhere, and together, we move forward. But in order to achieve a compromise I must learn to look at the world not only through my own eyes, but also through your eyes. And here I firmly believe that the Americans, including Reagan, have not yet managed to learn to look at the world through our eyes, in this case, and to also consider our interests. They know their own interests perfectly well. Theirs are all here and they will not abandon them. I think that they are not ready to understand and consider our interests, that is, to make this compromise, and that is the main point.

[Zorin] I would like to pick up your thought about compromise and quote an example. It has already been said that the U.S. President has declared that the United States is abandoning SALT II. They pretend that this treaty, in its time, was a big U.S. gift to the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, SALT II was precisely a compromise, a compromise in which each of the sides voluntarily imposed some kind of limitations on itself. The United States imposed limitations, and the Soviet Union imposed limitations, and that is diplomacy, compromise. If the United States abandons SALT II, the compromise is violated and this creates circumstances for the Soviet Union to also remove the limitations imposed on it by this treaty. This is a double-edged weapon and shows how dangerous it is in politics to violate these compromises.

It has to be said that some people in Washington, and it is evident in military circles, understand the danger of this kind of policy in the White House. I would like to stress again that in today's discussion we have expressed our personal points of view on the situation that has arisen in connection with the campaign started by the U.S. press.

The official response to the President's letter will follow, but insofar as the U.S. press has started this noisy campaign, I think that it would be useful for us to express our personal points of view.

In concluding our discussion, I would like to ask you, colleagues, this question: How would you now, this very minute, evaluate the situation existing today?

[Bovin] Well that is very difficult. For instance, I think that if we talk specifically about the summit meeting, the issue is still open. Neither Moscow nor Washington can say whether or not there will be such a meeting. On the one hand, naturally, preparations for it are being conducted. A visit by Comrade Shevardnadze to Washington has been set. A large team of U.S. experts has arrived in Moscow. This very large team is led by Paul Nitze and it includes Rowney, Kampelman...

[Zorin interrupts] Perle, who is not unknown!

[Bovin] Perle, Yes. They will hold consultations here concerning nuclear and space weapons. They are major figures in U.S. disarmament policy. Frankly, they basically deal more with rearmament than disarmament. Yet just the same, they will hold talks. In other words, preparations are in progress. But I repeat, from my point of view, the issue has not yet been solved unequivocally. And there is hardly anything strange in that, because when we talk about Soviet-U.S. relations and our talks with the Americans, it is a long distance race, and it is necessary to watch both Reagan and what will come after Reagan and be ready to cover that long distance. This is how I would put it.

[Zhurkin] Indeed, most probably the problem has to be viewed in several dimensions at once: First of all, in the dimensions of the present day, of all the burning issues of the day; secondly through the prism of the remainder of President Reagan's term, because, whether he likes it or not, the President and most of the people surrounding him have started moving toward the U.S. history textbook.

[Bovin interrupts] But the problem is how you will get into the textbook, with a plus or minus sign.

[Zorin] They say that it is considerably easier to blunder in history than to enter it [legche vlipnut chem v neye voyti].

[Zhurkin] We shall see. Obviously we must all look at this entire series of the most important political events also through the prism of what there will be after Reagan. We must think about that and think about it all the time. And not only about those who will come right after Reagan but generally about what the United States will be like in the nineties, the America which we will have to deal with then. Most probably it will not be easy then, either.

Returning to the present day, I think that it is necessary to make a final evalutation of this letter, this message of Reagan's. And probably the final evaluation will be simple. The ball is still in the U.S. court. No answers have been given yet to the Soviet proposals, the very fundamental Soviet proposals which have been evaluated as such, both in the United States and the entire world. So the word still remains with the United States, the Reagan administration. It still has to think how it will act in the present, very acute situation.

[Zorin] It may be that one of the causes of the unusual leak, that we have discussed, and of the ballyhoo started prematurely by U.S. propaganda and official leaders, lies preciselly in what you say, Vitaliy Vladimirovich: the feeling that no proper reply has been given; the feeling that the U.S. position is not arousing and will not arouse satisfaction among the public. And for this reason, substituting real steps with noise and intensifying propaganda with all kinds of inventions, and substituting real steps with propaganda fireworks may also be the aim and is being pursued by the organizers of the campaign of recent days.

Well, our time on the air has expired. It remains for me to thank you for taking part in our discussion, thank our television viewers, until we meet again, here in our studio.

END OF NATO TACTICAL FIGHTER EXERCISES CITED

LD101234 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 10 Aug 86

[Text] London August 10 TASS -- Large-scale NATO airforce exercises "Tactical Fighter Meet" ended in Britain. Airforce squadrons of Britain, the USA, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands and West Germany trained in the course of five days "cooperation of tactical fighter aircraft in conditions of imitated enemy encirclement." As the British press said, exercises of this kind have been for the first time held on Britain's territory. Observers are drawing attention to a clearly provocative character of the exercises. The scenario was openly anti-Soviet: Mock-ups of tanks, missile launchers and air defences with red stars were deployed on a territory of more than 250 square miles.

COMMENTARY EXAMINES FUTURE ROLE OF IMPERIALISM

PM061550 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Aug 86 Second Edition pp 2, 3

[Article by Major General Professor M. Monin, honored RSFSR scientist and doctor of historical sciences: "Trying to Remain in the Saddle of History. Imperialism -- Source of Aggression and Adventurism" -- first paragraph is a KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] Mankind is counting down the few years still remaining until the third millennium in a complex and uneasy atmosphere. The contemporary world, as the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th congress emphasized, is a world full of hope, because people have never before been so comprehensively equipped for the further development of civilization. At the same time, however, it is also a world overloaded with dangers and contradictions which encourage talk about almost the most alarming brink of history. The main cause of these dangers and alarms is the aggressive and adventurist policy of imperialism, primarily and particulary U.S. imperialism.

Reaction in All Directions

The coming to power of a dominant right-wing group in the United States was accompanied by a flood of loud words about its commitment to the cause of peace, international security, disarmament, respect for the national sovereignty of states on the planet, human rights, and so on and so forth. But this was nothing but camouflage. The practical actions of America's present rulers have proved to be of a diametrically opposite nature.

In the slightly more than 40 years since the time when the U.S. atom bomb reduced Hiroshima to ashes our planet has been literally crammed with mass destruction weapons. Specialists are now arguing only about how many times or how many dozens of times over the nuclear weapons stockpiled by all countries can destory all living things on earth if they were to be used. For example, according to estimates by the U.S. "Association of Nuclear Test Veterans," all living things on earth can be destroyed 70 times over.

These are alarming figures, which testify yet again that the threat of nuclear war is the main danger now hanging over mankind. A colossal danger exists because, as M.S. Gorbachev emphasized once again in his Vladivostok speech, a nuclear war would lead to universal catastrophe when human civilization would be threatened with extinction.

The Land of the Soviets, loyal to Lenin's policy of peace, has done and is doing everything possible to prevent a world thermonuclear conflagration, to halt the arms race, and to preserve and strengthen universal peace and security. It is sufficient to name our proposals and actions in this direction, such as the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the announcement and repeated extensions of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the radical program to free mankind of nuclear arms by the end of this century, and other recent peace initiatives.

But how do the Washington "peacemakers" reply to the voice of reason coming from the Soviet country? By blatantly continuing with nuclear explosions and giving an irrevocable "no!" as an answer to the Soviet proposal to reach agreement on the termination of nuclear tests. By refusing to observe the 1972 Interim Agreement and the 1979 SALT II treaty concluded between our countries, which limit strategic offensive weapons and the further buildup of such weapons. By quantitatively and qualitatively building up the already gigantic arsenals of chemical weapons and accelerating the work to implement the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." [paragraph continues]

It has been styled the "star wars" program by the world public because it is designed to place strike nuclear weapons in space and target them against the Soviet Union and its friends and allies.

Having taken the bit between their teeth and continuing their efforts to build higher and higher mountains of mass destruction weapons, the imperialists imagine that they will thus succeed in disrupting in their favor the strategic parity prevailing between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, in exhausting our country economically, and in impeding the fulfillment of the social program. The very same goal of weakening the Soviet Union is also served by the policy pursued by U.S. ruling circles and their allies of economic sanctions, discriminatory measures in the sphere of trade and credits, and so on, and also by the incessant ideological subversions which are at times hardly distinguishable from operations in proper "psychological warfare."

A graphic example of this is provided by the recent campaign of lies and slander against the USSR launched in the West in connection with the Chernobyl AES accident. Cramming people in the West with incredible fabrications, its organizers strove by all means to discredit the Soviet Union and Soviet foreign policy, to weaken the effect of the Soviet proposals for the termination of nuclear tests and the elimination of nuclear weapons, and at the same time to neutralize the growing criticism of U.S. behavior in the international arena and its militarist course.

In actual fact, this behavior is far from gentlemanly. Relying on its riches and might and invoking the Lord as if He had placed the fate of all mankind in its hands, U.S. imperialism is openly voicing its claims to world domination and has already arbitrarily proclaimed almost entire continents to be zones of its "vital interests." Not only has it proclaimed this but, regardless of obstacles, it is pursuing a course of hegemonism and diktat.

Many crimes have been listed in the service record of the neoglobalists from across the ocean in recent times. One of them is the piratical attack against Libya. For a long time now this sovereign Arab state, pursuing an independent policy, has been causing the U.S. Administration displeasure. Suddenly, in violation of elementary norms of international law and human morals and on the false pretext of Libyan complicity in terrorist activity abroad, its cities were hit by a missile and bomb strike by the U.S. Air Force, which resulted in the death of many totally innocent people. This gangster-like attack, which cannot be described as anything but an act of state terrorism, generated a storm of indignation all over the world. Even some of the loyal U.S. allies tried to distance themselves from it.

The escalation of reactionary tendencies is distinctly visible not only in the foreign but also in the domestic policy of imperialism. The machinery of exploitation is becoming increasingly complex and sophisticated. Chronic unemployment, inflation, and cutbacks in social programs on the pretext of savings are leading to a decline of working people's living standards. Last year, for example, official data in the United States listed 34 million persons living below the poverty line. In other words, one out of every seven residents of this, the richest country in the capitalist world, was a pauper.

The spiritual enslavement of working people in the capitalist countries is being stepped up. The propaganda of anti-Sovietism and anticommunism, the fanning of national arrogance and chauvinism, the contempt for others' rights and interests, and the inculcation of the cult of individualism, violence, and total license are all becoming increasingly importunate. As in everything, the United States marches in the front ranks.

What lies beneath the hardening of this anti-people policy? Why is the capitalist monster on the rampage?

Nostalgia

The reasons are no secret. "The more the march of historical development erodes imperialism's positions," the new edition of the party program emphasizes, "the more hostile to the interests of the peoples the policy of its most reactionary forces becomes. Imperialism furiously opposes social progress and makes attempts to halt the march of history, to undermine the positions of socialism, and to gain social revenge on a worldwide scale. The imperialist powers strive to coordinate their economic, political, and ideological strategy and attempt to create a common front of struggle against socialism, against all revolutionary and liberation movements."

It is this dream -- to restore the past -- that guides the actions of the imperialist bourgeoisie. It embarked on detente in the past not because it had been suddenly imbued with love for peace (the aggressive essence of imperialism is a constant), but because it calculated on using it for ideological infiltration in socialist countries, for the erosion of socialism, and for the undermining of its foundations. But the expectations failed to materialize. The forces of real socialism continued to grow, the relative weight of countries liberated from the yoke of colonial slavery in world politics and economics increased steadily, and the struggle for peace, democracy, and better future waged by the broad masses of working people in the very citadels of capitalism gained increasingly broad scope. Thus, imperialism brought to the foreground of political power in the United States and other Western countries right-wing and extremely conservative groups, whose efforts resulted in a sharp turn from detente in the direction of crude and unceremonious pressure by military force.

The issue does not, however, concern just the political factors which determined this turn. A considerable role was also played by the imperialists' economic calculations. "War -- a 'terrible' thing?", V.I. Lenin wrote in the past. "Yes. But it is a terribly LUCRATIVE [preceding word published in boldface] thing." And the arms race is particularly lucrative for today's arms manufacturers.

In the United States, for example, in the early eighties the profit per 1 dollar of sales by firms supplying military output was more than 70 percent higher than the corresponding indicator for companies producing consumer durables. The scales of military production are colossal and continue to expand swiftly. For example, the Reagan administration plans to spend $21.6 billion on the implementation of the program for the creation [sozdaniye] of MX missiles, $28.2 billion on the development [razrabotka] and production of B-1B strategic bombers, and $53.5 billion on nuclear-powered submarines with "Trident" nuclear missiles. And the space weapons program within the "Strategic Defense Initiative" framework will cost a stupendous total of $1-1.5 trillion. Considerable funds are planned to be spent on the needs of the god of war by the FRG, Britain, and other U.S. allies in NATO.

The profits of just 10 military-industrial corporations working for the Pentagon amounted to more than $8.6 billion in 1984. It is not hard to imagine how the anticipation of fabulous new profits makes their mouths water, or the hatred with which they react to the growing demands by the peoples in the planet that an end be put to the arms race. In addition to them, hundreds and thousands of other arms manufacturers and the entire military-industrial complex are eager to grab a piece of the pie of military orders.

Imperialism's selfish interests also underlie the hardening of its policy toward the developing countries. Forced to accept the political independence gained by former colonies and semi-colonies in acute struggle, imperialism resolutely counters their efforts to gain economic independence and take the path of social progress. It strives to consolidate and intensify the sophisticated system of neocolonialist exploitation, to tie a considerable number of liberated states even more closely to itself, and to extract even more actively predatory profits from this gigantic treasury of the riches of others.

The following data give an idea of the scale of the plunder. Each year the imperialist states extort more than $250 billion from developing countries. In the last decade alone the profits extorted by U.S. corporations from these countries have been four times larger than their investments. During the same period the profits earned by U.S. monopolies in Latin America and the Caribbean were more than eight times larger than investments. Is it therefore surprising that the gap between the levels of economic development and per capita incomes in developed capitalist countries and liberated countries is not only failing to close but, on the contrary, is growing steadily wider? In 1982, for example, the average annual level of gross domestic product per capita in the United States was $13,157, against $652 in developing African countries and $674 in Asia. Twenty times less!

In actual fact, the transnational corporations, whose activities are largely typical of the nature of contemporary imperialism, plunder the riches and undermine the sovereignty not only of developing countries but also of developed capitalist states. Moreover, the U.S. supermonopolies, constituting the nucleus of transnational monopoly capital, as a rule actively play the role of bearers of state hegemonism and the imperial aspirations of that country's ruling forces. Let us recall, for example, the sinister role played by the major U.S. corporation ITT in the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile.

What can be the result of this policy in the international arena and inside [imperialism's] own states?

What Lies Beyond the Horizon

Even though capitalism has already passed the high point of its development, even though its entire machinery is infected with the cancerous tumor of exacerbating general crisis, it is still strong and strives to build up this strength. The dazzle of strength blinds its reactionary leaders, giving them an illusion of total license and pushing them into more and more reckless new dangerous political adventures. But, as the new edition of the party program emphasizes, "the dialectics of development is such that the actual means which imperialism sets in motion in order to consolidate its positions inevitably lead to the exacerbation of all its deep-seated contradictions."

World reaction has already brought and can still bring many misfortunes upon mankind by continuing the arms race, balancing on the brink of war, and threatening to unleash a world nuclear conflict. But imperialism did not manage to hinder the affirmation of the new system when the torch of progress -- the Land of the Soviets -- was an isolated island in the vast sea of capitalist encirclement, even though armed intervention, economic blockade, secret subversive actions, and much else was used against it. Nor is there any hope for its present policy of total antagonism and military confrontation, aimed at gaining social revenge. [paragraph continues]

This is because the economic and military might of the Soviet Union, the other socialist community countries, and the whole socialist world, a might placed in the service of the cause of peace, is steadily growing, the will for peace of the majority of Asian, African, and Latin American countries is gathering strength, and the democratic and antiwar movements, constituting as a whole an enormous potential of peace, common sense, and goodwill and a powerful counterweight to the imperialists' deeds and schemes, are expanding in scope.

World reaction has already brought and can still bring many misfortunes upon the people in developing countries by continuing to mercilessly exploit their riches, obstructing economic and social renewal, and suppressing by force of arms the people's desire to decide their fate by themselves. But just as imperialism failed to prevent the collapse of its colonial empire, it will fail to preserve the present system of enriching itself through the exploitation and super-exploitation of the people of young states. The military strength on which it relies will not solve the problems. It can only complicate the situation and engender new conflicts.

World reaction has already brought and can still bring many misfortunes upon working people in the capitalist countries themselves by stepping up the offensive against their vital rights and the social gains acquired as a result of a hard struggle. It is understandable that there can be no question of class peace and national cohesion, which are the favorite subjects of bourgeois propaganda. On the contrary, such a situation is fraught with social tremors and political destabilization, in other words with further exacerbation of the basic contradiction under capitalism, the contradiction between labor and capital.

The imperialist policy of strength in international and domestic affairs is doomed by history. This is obvious. It is, however, also obvious that imperialism can be curbed only through persistent struggle by the people against its schemes, a struggle for peace and international security, for democracy and social progress. As regards our Soviet people and their servicemen, they have made, are making, and will continue to make a fitting contribution to this just and noble struggle.

PONOMAREV VIEWS NAVAL ARMS RACE, PACIFIC SECURITY

PM051231 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Aug 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Position of Reason Against 'Position of Strength'"]

[Text] The world is living through an alarming and crucial stage in its development. What is needed to fundamentally improve the international situation, remove the threat of war, and strengthen the peoples' security is a new approach, political will, farsighted decisions, and practical actions. What is needed is a new philosophy of international relations and new concepts of international security.

A new understanding of the present level of development of civilization, international relations, and peace -- this is the imperious demand of the times. It dictates the urgency of fundamentally breaking with many customary foreign policy means and methods and breaking with the traditions of political thought and views on problems of war and peace, on the security of individual states, and on international security. Just such an approach is formulated in the 27th CPSU Congress documents. The CPSU and the Soviet state are guided by just such an approach in their practical activity in the world arena. The USSR considers political means of averting the threat of war the only acceptable and possible means. This is the basis of the Soviet concept of ensuring international security in the nuclear and space age.

Awareness of the realities of this age and of the lack of an alternative to the Soviet philosophy of peace and international relations is increasingly making its way into life. This is vividly shown by the flood of comments on Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's speech at the ceremonial meeting devoted to the presentation of the Order of Lenin to Vladivostok. In Soviet policy, words are not at variance with deeds -- this is the leitmotiv of these comments. The USSR's proposals demonstrate its sincere desire to unravel the knots of dispute in international relations using political means. On the basis of an accurate analysis of the situation in the Asia and Pacific region specific initiatives aimed at strengthening peace and international security have been advanced. The Soviet Union's global approach to these problems and the political boldness and concreteness of the Soviet initiatives are particularly emphasized.

It goes without saying that not everyone in the modern, complex world has positively welcomed the ideas expounded by the Soviet leader. The position of the White House, which considers the USSR's constructive new initiatives "inadequate," remains unchanged. But, in the opinion of serious observers, Washington will not manage to play hide-and-seek and avoid replying to them for long. In the United States itself there is an appreciable increase in sentiments in favor of reaching accords with the Soviet Union and curbing the arms race. These sentiments may be found among public representatives, in articles in the mass media, and in statements by many prominent politicians.

The USSR's approach to relations with the United States is well-known. The Soviet Union, as was reaffirmed most definitely in Vladivostok, advocates peaceful, good-neighborly, equitable relations and mutually advantageous cooperation. The most important issue in Soviet-American relations today is the question of ending the arms race. The USSR has made many large-scale proposals on all the problems of reducing and eliminating arms and verifying [kontrol] this process. These proposals are widely known and can serve as the basis for settling the very acute problems of concern to all mankind.

Unfortunately, however, no U.S. countermovement is yet visible. The American "star wars" program still remains an obstacle in the way of Soviet-U.S. talks on reducing arms. The U.S. ruling circles' desire for world supremacy and for the "position of strength" policy is still perfectly evident. Even the reactionary West German newspaper DIE WELT writes: "Reagan's foreign policy is aimed at restoring American influence in the world... For this the nation must strengthen the Armed Forces."

For many years now official Washington has been continuing to build up its strategic offensive forces and general-purpose forces and implementing far-reaching militarist plans. And it does not intend to stop. This is what no less authoritative a person than Admiral W. Crowe, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says: "We are only in the middle of the process of modernizing our forces. We will be able to look confidently to the future if we implement the President's program in full."

So this is how Washington sees the future: mountains of weapons, the shifting of the arms race into space, and the sinister shadow of nuclear catastrophe. They do not want to reckon with realities and are continuing to make policy on the basis of illusions and delusions.

Dangerous illusions, dangerous delusions..! And they threaten increasingly dangerous consequences. The current U.S. "reforms in the defense sphere" are fraught with them. They are aimed at "enhancing America's military effectiveness," as the President's message to Congress states. [paragraph continues]

Special significance here is attached to ensuring the greatest "freedom of action" for the Pentagon and minimizing the legislative organs' control over its activity and budget.

This "freedom of action" takes the form of new hundreds of billions of dollars for the arms race and of new missiles, aircraft, submarines, tanks, and guns. Details of a comprehensive plan drafted by the administration to set up a military infrastructure designed, as THE WASHINGTON POST writes, not only to ensure the possibility of waging a nuclear war but also to "survive it, preserve our forces, and prepare to conduct new combat operations" have just become known. It is impossible not to recall the White House refusal to observe the SALT II treaty and to subscribe to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. What is more, reports have appeared in the American press that in the coming decade the United States envisages carrying out approximately 1,000 underground nuclear explosions for the purpose of modernizing existing nuclear weapons and creating [sozdaniye] "third-generation" nuclear weapons and weapons for "star wars."

We have repeatedly written about this in detail. Nevertheless, I would like to draw special attention to the measures the United States is taking to enhance the combat potential of its Navy, which has long been America's "big stick." "From the South China Sea to the Gulf of Sidra the U.S. Navy today serves as striking testimony to the new American might," the magazine U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT writes. Breathlessly describing the large-scale buildup of the American fleet in recent years, the magazine singles out the deployment of Trident system nuclear-powered submarines -- which, in its words, "can change the strategic nuclear balance in the U.S. favor" -- and also the creation of three new aircraft carrier combat groups and four operations groups of capital ships. The Pentagon and Navy leadership, the magazine emphasizes, is doing everything to implement R. Reagan's demand: "For us naval superiority is a necessity."

Of all the oceans, special attention is devoted to the Pacific. The aforementioned Adm Crowe pathetically exclaims: "It would be a disaster if we ever allowed the correlation of forces in the Pacific to worsen." By all accounts, certain U.S. political circles whose interests Crowe serves can only imagine the future of the Asia and Pacific region in the form of a confrontation between various countries. The actions the United States is taking lead to increased tension in the region.

These actions are frequently concealed behind various kinds of fabrications about the Soviet Union building up its armed might in the east of the country. In fact, the USSR is not doing, nor does it intend to do anything beyond what accords with the minimum requirements of defense and the protection of its friends and allies, particularly taking American military activity in that region into account.

At the same time, the Soviet Union advances a number of major initiatives aimed at ensuring the security of all countries that are drawn to the Pacific. Of special significance in this respect would be the convening of a Pacific conference modeled on the Helsinki conference and, in general, the inclusion of the Asia and Pacific region in the overall process of creating an all-embracing system of international security, which was spoken of at the 27th CPSU Congress.

Here there is a need to solve the questions of a regional settlement, of erecting a barrier in the way of the proliferation and buildup of nuclear weapons, implementing the Soviet proposal to begin talks on reducing the activeness of military fleets -- primarily ships equipped with nuclear weapons -- in the Pacific, radically reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Asia to the limits of reasonable adequacy, and shifting onto a practical plane the discussion of confidence-building measures and the nonuse of force in the region.

At the same time, the Soviet Union proposes beginning a broad exchange of opinions among all the interested countries in that part of the world on questions of organizing equitable, mutually advantageous, and stable trade, economic, technological, scientific, and cultural cooperation.

The strengthening of good-neighborliness and friendship among all Asian and Pacific countries and the pooling of their efforts in the common search for constructive solutions to the problems of security in Asia and the Pacific region would not only have a favorable effect on the situation in the region but also make a major contribution to the cause of preserving and strengthening world peace. This is why the Soviet Union considers it necessary to look at questions of world politics also from an Asian and Pacific viewpoint. At the same time, the USSR does not forget the main issue -- how to advance the problem of ending the arms race.

To this end the USSR has submitted important proposals during the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. They provide, in particular, for a ban on antisatellite means and on space arms of the "space-to-earth" class and a commitment by both countries not to withdraw from the treaty on limiting ABM systems for at least 15 years. At the same time, it is proposed to strictly limit new work in the sphere of ABM systems, including work under the SDI program, to laboratory research. As for verification [kontrol], the USSR has already advocated open familiarization with the activities of corresponding laboratories. At the same time, the Soviet Union has submitted at the Geneva talks an interim compromise version for reducing strategic nuclear arms that could be implemented without delay, in 5-6 years, if an accord is reached not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty for 15 years.

The Soviet Union's major new compromise proposals on this score were set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's June letter to the U.S. President. As is known, a reply to that letter was received recently. It is now being studied, studied with all responsibility and attention, to determine how far the proposals it contains accord with the principle of equal security and whether they make it possible to arrive at effective joint decisions in the sphere for ending the arms race and preventing it from moving into space.

It is now possible to meet in the press of Western countries, and in the American press above all, many conflicting views on the messages exchanged by the Soviet and American leaders. It is felt that a skilled hand in Washington perpetrated a deliberate leak of information about the American side's position so as to see that the Soviet side's reaction would be. Let us not run ahead. The very near future must show whether the U.S. leadership will be able to abandon its hegemonist approach to problems of world politics and the desire to secure military superiority in order to be able to dictate its will to other countries and peoples, or whether it will keep to its former positions. But we must remind it once again that it must not speak with the Soviet Union from a "position of strength." The times demand that this be replaced by a position of reasons.

BOVIN ON U.S. APPROACH TO SUMMIT, NEGOTIATIONS

PM091910 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Aug 86 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin article: "Feigned Optimism"]

[Text] It is probable that everyone who takes an interest in politics would like to read the letters exchanged between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President. But letters -- political ones especially -- are not always intended for general consumption. There are subjects whose discussion -- at certain stages at least -- demands confidentiality. Negotiations, R. Reagan has remarked, are "tender plants that can wither and die in the glare of publicity." Well, I will grant you that -- with reservations...

However, before politicans in Moscow had time to read the President's message attentively, journalists in Washington were already well into a discussion of its contents. Their judgments, as has indeed been established, were extremely diverse. But those commentaries that reflected the position of the White House were couched in approximately the following terms. The administration has studied M.S. Gorbachev's letter most attentively and sees positive elements in it; in its turn the administration is taking a big step in Moscow's direction and, as far as possible, is heeding the Russians' concern and wishes; hence, "the ball is now in the Soviet court." The optimistic conclusion is made that R. Reagan's letter will open wide the door to the second Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and permits the hope that everything will be "okay".

This is their reasoning. The causes of this official and semiofficial optimism are not hard to understand. Having clearly overdone it in connection with the "strong-arm game," the negativism, and all manner of provocative tricks, encountering growing pressure from its allies -- and indeed from U.S. public opinion -- and not wishing to appear too "hawkish" in the run-in to the November elections, the administration is seeking to display its peacemaking face, to sooth the allies, and to demonstrate to American its concern to improve relations between the United States and the USSR.

One could only rejoice if such a shift had actually occurred in Washington's policy. For the time being, however, there are no grounds for rejoicing. Or, to put it midly, there is little ground for rejoicing. Of course, I do not know what the official reaction to the U.S. President's letter will be. But it seems to me that this letter -- judging by what is being written in Washington and said in Moscow concerning its contents -- can in no way be viewed as movement toward an accord, toward a compromise, toward a reasonable balance of interests.

Let us examine the main issue -- SDI, the "star wars" program. Our idea is a complete ban on the emplacement of weapons in space. As a traditional stage we have proposed that the ARM Treaty be observed for a period of some 15-20 years; that is, to confine research [issledovaniye] in the said field to the laboratory. During this period we also proposed to radically reduce the offensive potentials of nuclear weapons.

What is the U.S. President proposing? Over a 5-year period the sides will research, develop, and test [issledovat, rasrabatyvat, ispytyvat] antimissile systems but not deploy [razvorachivat] them. If the research and testing show that such systems can be created [sozdat], the sides will undergo negotiatons for 2 years on how to move towards "an era of defensive systems." If these negotiations prove to be fruitless, each side has the right to deploy its system, after giving the other side 6 months notice of the beginning of deployment.

Now let us look more closely.

First, the stated 5-year period has no practical significance whatsoever, inasmuch as -- according to those in charge of the "star wars" program -- the Americans will be able to start deploying the ABM system only in the mid-1990's, that is, in a minimum of 10 years.

Second, throughout these 5 years the Americans intend to violate [narushat] the ABM Treaty "without exceeding" it ["ne vykhodya" iz] because they intend to take the research outside the laboratories. Indeed the very "research" itself is understood extremely broadly -- even as far as full-scale tests [ispytaniya v realnykh masshtabakh].

Third, the Americans are proposing negotiations not on prohibiting the militarization of space but on how and at what pace to pursue this militarization. In the final analysis they are reserving for themselves the right to act as they deem fit.

So just where is the consideration of "Soviet concern" here? Where is the movement toward compromise? What we are essentially being offered is to express with our own signature our assent to the U.S. "star wars" program. And nothing else.

I will not go into the other elements of R. Reagan's letter scattered about the pages of the Western press. They are all formulated according to a single design: to take account of U.S. interests to the maximum degree while at the same time ignoring the interests of the USSR. Here, however, I must mention some reservations. The letter possibly does contain some pluses or other, some interesting details, some sort of movement along the path toward mutual understanding. But, as they say, on analyzing the whole picture there is no sign of any of this [no pri analize, tak skazat, na slukh vsego etogo ne vidno].

Correspondingly, nor is there any sign of promising signals testifying to the President's desire to complete his meeting with M.S. Gorbachev with a specific constructive result. Fly across the ocean merely to get to know each other again? Scarcely much point in that. One would very much like the meeting to take place and for it not to be reduced to a routine "spirit" but really improve Soviet-U.S. relations, and to advance the cause of disarmament. But, unlike, say, a moratorium, an agreement cannot be unilateral. It would be useful if people in and around the White House ceased negotiating with each other and thought seriously about how negotiations with the Soviet Union should be pursued. Neither pressure nor cunning will work here. Only honesty. Only the desire and the ability to understand one's partner's concerns and interests.

THE WASHINGTON POST recently cited the following utterance of "one White House official": Weinberger "would have to be dragged by the ears to an agreement." If it were only Weinberger... And this is the whole point. Washington has already learned to talk about the fact that it is necessary to reach agreement [dogovarivatsya]. People there are still not inwardly disposed toward such agreement. In my opinion R. Reagan's letter reflects precisely such a picture.

Of course, nobody can prohibit Americans from accompanying the utterances of their President with optimistic fanfares. All the same, it is better not to be too hasty.

PETROVSKIY COMMENTS ON RELATIONS WITH U.S.

LD072104 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1910 GMT 7 Aug 86

[From the "Panorama" program; correspondent Alajos Chrudinak interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy; date and place not given; Petrovskiy in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation -- recorded]

[Text] [Chrudinak] Since Mikhail Gorbachev was elected general secretary the Soviet Union's foreign policy, methods have changed, the style of its international politics has altered. In other words, in Soviet policy one can observe new features, a new kind of foreign political approach, attitude. In your opinion, what has changed?

[Petrovskiy] I think you are justified in asking this question. Really, since the session of the Central Committee held in April 1985, a new way of thinking has been introduced in our foreign policy. This new kind of thinking, which determines how our state acts in international affairs, is in brief nothing else but a sort of amalgam of the philosophy of staying alive, of survival, which makes only one kind of conduct possible, that of cooperation among states. Therefore, this philosophy of staying alive has to be alloyed with concrete, practical, deeds that promote and make possible the radical reordering of international relations on the basis of democratic principles. A new style is beginning to be introduced in our country in the shape and conduct of democratic -- I beg your pardon -- of international relations. I would say that this style is democratic; it is a style that is based on the generally accepted, civilized norms of international contact. It is a style that promotes cooperation and mutual understanding among people.

[Chrudinak] Does this new approach, this new style, appear first and foremost in General Secretary Gorbachev's latest, numerous new proposals and initiatives? In other words, in what does this new style and outlook, manifest itself?

[Petrovskiy] It manifests itself in the fact that the proposals we place on the negotiating table, or those we submit at various international forums, are not just initiatives that have been formulated in Moscow. They are initiatives that also take into consideration others' proposals, those proposals that strive to approach and resolve international affairs, world political issues, in a realistic way.

[Chrudinak] Why, I wonder, does the Reagan amdinistration not understand or recognize this new Soviet style? Or is it rather that this style confuses it? What is your opinion?

[Petrovskiy] I think that the acceptance of this new style, of this new method of approach, depends first and foremost on the recognition of the realities that exist in the world. It is a question of realities, which, as I have mentioned already, leave us no alternative but cooperation. Naturally, the various states have different national interests and these national interests are motivated by social and other viewpoints. But we have to rise above narrow national interests. We have to be guided by the realization that we live in a world which, while contradictory, is nevertheless founded on mutual dependence.

[Chrudinak] Excuse me, I would like to once again return to the basic issue. Does this, then, mean that President Reagan found the old Soviet style much more pleasing? Or in other words, was the Soviet Union's former foreign policy style more favorable to him than the present one?

[Petrovskiy] Well, I do not know how I should judge Reagan in concrete terms. It is difficult for me to talk about what is in the heads of Reagan and his men. But I hope that finally the realistic direction will be victorious in the U.S. foreign policy.

[Chrudinak] This, then, means that the Soviet Union's foreign policy style has changed. But for the time being the style of the United States has not. Still, it would seem that some kind of change has been visible of late. However, I cannot say if it is merely a question of some kind of smile diplomacy, or if perhaps more serious things are happening, because in the last few days President Reagan described the June proposals of General Secretary Gorbachev as a turning point. Other U.S. politicians, on the other hand, are saying these days -- as yesterday Reagan himself was claiming -- that these proposals are merely propaganda maneuvers.

[Chrudinak] What has really happened? In your opinion, what has happened in the White House on the topic of the Soviet proposals of June, to speak about a turning point?

[Petrovskiy] Well, what can I say about that? Naturally, it, in itself, undoubtedly is a good thing; it appears to be a good sign, that the proposals coming from Moscow are evaluated favorably. However, in order for us to be able to make a final judgement on what it means now, concrete deeds, concrete answers would be necessary on the part of the Americans.

[Chrudinak] Are you thinking of mutual concessions and therefore a compromise?

[Petrovskiy] That is exactly correct.

[Chrudinak] My conviction is that it is essential in order for you to be able to in the end, sign some kind of agreement.

[Petrovskiy] That is exactly so. The new style, the new way of thinking naturally presupposes compromise. There is no agreement without compromise. There is need for movement toward one another. We strive for a rational compromise; a compromise that accords with the equal and reciprocal security of the Soviet Union, the United States and its allies alike. Without compromise not a single issue can be resolved.

In the nuclear and space age the basis of achieving political agreements is compromise, a basis of agreements that take into consideration the balance of the interests of the opoposing sides.

[Chrudinak] A debate is now going on over the date of the Soviet-U.S. summit. How do you view it? Is there any possibility at all of this long-expected summit between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan taking place some time at the end of this year?

[Petrovskiy] Again I can only speak about what concerns us. We would like this meeting. We regard summits as an extremely important mechanism that enable progress toward the settlement of political problems between various countries.

[Chrudinak] It is very interesting for me that President Reagan now emphasizes that he reached agreement with General Secretary Gorbachev, that Gorbachev promised him they would meet again this year, as if the Geneva summit consisted only of such a promise.

[Petrovskiy] In connection with that I would like to say -- perhaps it does not sound overly diplomatic from me, but I must say it -- that here we might be witnesses of a certain displacement of emphasis. Precisely in Geneva the agreement came into being that we should endeavor to prevent the arms race in space, end the arms race on earth and normalize Soviet-U.S. relations. For precisely this reason, with this aim, we expressed our readiness for the next summit meeting. It is only an instrument. I say that the summit is not an end in itself, it is only an instrument for solving the important issues on the agenda in world politics and in Soviet-U.S. relations alike.

[Chrudinak] Now is there not any possibility of such a summit? Do you not now see any possibility of this?

[Petrovskiy] Well, as I said, the stance of the other side ought to be accurately known. However, we can speak with full resolution about our own stance.

[Chrudinak] In your opinion what are the most important conditions for the summit between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan?

[Petrovskiy] I would rather avoid the expression "conditions", because...

[Chrudinak, interrupting] But they say that the Soviets attach conditions to the meeting.

[Petrovskiy] We are not speaking about conditions. We are of the opinion that a summit must have substance. The meeting must be filled with realistic, practical substance. In the second place, a suitable atmosphere would be necessary.

[Chrudinak] Nevertheless, what kind of concessions does the Soviet Union await from President Reagan?

[Petrovskiy] Look, we are of the opinion that the fundamental problem now -- and the problem is connected to it -- is that we cannot permit the spread of the arms race to space, and we must also prevent it on earth. For that reason, one of our most important proposals says -- by the way it takes into consideration the stance of the U.S. side too -- that we must agree that we will not avail ourselves of the opportunity to break the agreement concluded on antimissile defense systems; in accordance with that, we must draw the boundary between the permitted and prohibited research mentioned in the agreement.

We have a realistic attitude toward that issue. We believe that we must accept the level of research the United States has achieved to date; but the use of the various weapon prototypes and models for space weapons experiments must be banned.

[Chrudinak] What concessions is the Soviet Union willing to make, if you are allowed to speak about it at all?

[Petrovskiy] Why might it not be allowed? Naturally it is allowed, indeed, in my opinion we must speak about it. We are ready in every sphere to go halfway toward them, halfway. I have spoken to you about topics related to antimissile systems and space weapons.

[Chrudinak] But what compromise do you consider possible?

[Petrovskiy] We have also proposed other compromise frameworks. In this connection we have proposed, for example, that we approach on a compromise basis the solution of problems related to the limitation of strategic offensive weapons.

However, the U.S. side categorically rejected the entirely rational demand of ours, that among the strategic weapons able to reach one another's territory...

[Chrudinak interrupting] The intercontinental missiles.

[Petrovskiy] Yes, that we must count, list among them the advanced-based combat equipment, the missile-carrying aircraft, as well as the bombers sited in Europe. That is why we postponed the discussion of this issue, and we examined only the affair of ICBM's as well as the missiles placed on submarines and heavy bombers. Please -- we have given them an opportunity, and now we are waiting for the other side to accept our new proposals, which also take into account their interests.

[Chrudinak] Therefore, in your opinion it is not so difficult to conclude a compromise here.

[Petrovskiy] You know, personally I am of the opinion -- I can say it on the basis of specialist work experience, because I have been conducting such negotiations for many years; in the period of detente I took part in the negotiations related to both the European process and the Soviet-U.S. relationship -- I can tell you: if there is the political intention, maybe it sounds banal, but precisely if there is the political intention, the political will, then any issue can be resolved.

[Chrudinak] What does President Reagan want?

[Petrovskiy] In my opinion, Reagan does not want any kind of agreement. He wants to demolish the existing ones. We have already placed all of our proposals submitted in the interest of agreement -- we have already spoken about these at the beginning of the conversation -- on the negotiating table, and we are now waiting for a constructive reply to them. We hope that we will get these in the end.

[Chrudinak] I would like to ask you a question that seems sensitive: Let us suppose that Washington and President Reagan by no means want to reach agreement with the Soviet Union. What would happen in that instance? How would you react to that? What would you do?

[Petrovskiy] You know, I really would not like to speak about that. One of a person's characteristics is that he likes to view things optimistically. In my view, optimism is one of man's innate fundamental characteristics. But if the worse were to occur, we would have no choice other than to respond to that challenge.

[Chrudinak] How? How is it possible to respond to that?

[Petrovskiy] Response: now, you know, an arms race launched in a certain direction can always be counterbalanced with the development of weapons in the opposite direction. In this or that direction -- so that we would not allow the military balance to be upset.

But I do not believe anyone would gain from this. Not only the Soviet people, but probably the American people, and all mankind would not gain anything from this, because all of us would get into an extremely dangerous situation, all the more so because cause for special concern is given by -- it is enough if we think of the accident that occured in our country at Chernobyl. That accident demonstrated that technology can become uncontrollable. It was a tragedy which, from a nuclear viewpoints, took place in peaceful conditions. But imagine nuclear catastrophes that can be caused with weapons -- take the accident that occurred with the Challenger spacecraft.

[Petrovskiy] In connection with that I would like to say -- perhaps it does not sound overly diplomatic from me, but I must say it -- that here we might be witnesses of a certain displacement of emphasis. Precisely in Geneva the agreement came into being that we should endeavor to prevent the arms race in space, end the arms race on earth and normalize Soviet-U.S. relations. For precisely this reason, with this aim, we expressed our readiness for the next summit meeting. It is only an instrument. I say that the summit is not an end in itself, it is only an instrument for solving the important issues on the agenda in world politics and Soviet-U.S. relations alike.

[Chrudinak] Now is there not any possibility of such a summit? Do you not now see any possibility of this?

[Petrovskiy] Well, as I said, the stance of the other side ought to be accurately known. However, we can speak with full resolution about our own stance.

[Churdinak] In your opinion what are the most important conditions for the summit between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan?

[Petrovskiy] I would rather avoid the expression "conditions because...

[Chrudinak, interruption] But they say that the Soviets attach conditions to the meeting.

[Petrovskiy] We are not speaking about conditions. We are of the opinion that a summit must have substance. The meeting must be filled with realistic, practical substance. In the second place, a suitable atmosphere would be necessary.

[Chrudinak] Nevertheless, what kind of concessions does the Soviet Union await from President Reagan?

[Petrovskiy] Look, we are of the opinion that the fundamental problem now -- and the problem is connected to it -- is that we cannot permit the spread of the arms race to space, and we must also prevent it on earth. For that reason, one of our most important proposals says -- by the way it takes into consideration the stance of the U.S. side too -- that we must agree that we will not avail ourselves of the opportunity to break the agreement concluded on antimissile defense systems; in accordance with that, we must draw the boundary between the permitted and prohibited research mentioned in the agreement.

We have a realistic attitude toward that issue. We believe that we must accept the level of research the United States has achieved to date; but the use of the various weapon prototypes and models for space weapons experiments must be banned.

[Chrudinak] What concessions is the Soviet Union willing to make, if you are allowed to speak about it at all?

[Petrovskiy] Why might it not be allowed? Naturally it is allowed, indeed, in my opinion we must speak about it. We are ready in every sphere to go halfway toward them, halfway. I have spoken to you about topics related to antimissile systems and space weapons.

[Chrudinak] But what compromise do you consider possible?

[Petrovskiy] We have also proposed other compromise frameworks. In this connection we have proposed, for example, that we approach on a compromise basis the solution of problems related to the limitation of strategic offensive weapons.

If it had occurred in the era of space weapons, we do not rule out that it might have automatically led to the outbreak of war.

[Chrudinak] Nevertheless it appears that Washington and President Reagan want to force an arms race on the Soviet Union. Thus they would like to cause economic problems, difficulties for it, because, according to their calculations, the Soviet Union would not be able to undertake an arms race with the United States.

[Petrovskiy] The arms race of course is no gift. It is natural that the arms race is a heavy burden on our country's economy. Nevertheless, if such a challenge reaches us, we respond to it. But it is not our choice. We do not give it priority.

We have drawn conclusions for ourselves from the long lessons of history. This must also be done by the other side. We are well aware that it is not possible, and not permissible, to resolve any kind of problem with military means and an arms race. For that reason it is better if we seek a political solution.

In the Soviet Union we have now set for ourselves a very clearly determined goal: in our country we must accelerate social and economic development. We have subordinated to this every foreign political action and measure of ours, because we will achieve this goal, in any conditions. Of course, we are counting on our successfully creating favorable international conditions for this.

REAGAN CONTINUES TO DEFEND 'STAR WARS' PROGRAM

OW091232 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Aleksandr Yevdokimov commentary; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] U.S. President Reagan has come out with another speech in defense of the star wars program. Here is our commentary:

[Yevdokimov] Hello comrades. Stormy debate is going on these days in the U.S. Congress on the U.S. military draft budget for the coming financial year. Criticism of the so-called SDI is becoming louder and louder, and demands for reducing the budget requested by the White House for implementing this program are increasing in the Senate and the House of Representatives. The atmosphere in Congress cannot but arouse certain concern of the administration chief over the future of his favorable creation; therefore, he has resorted to the tested method of pressuring congressmen.

Observers think that the President's speech at his meeting with representatives of rightist organizations and military industrial monopolies serves the same purposes. He said again that under no circumstances will SDI become an issue at arms limitation talks. The President stressed that the United States intends to complete the development of the ABM space system and then deploy it.

The defensive character of SDI and that it can serve the cause of eliminating nuclear arms on earth was emphasized in every way, but all this is sheer demagogy. Reagan claims that SDI is a space shield, but in fact, it represents the deployment in space of first strike weapons capable of hitting any target, any objective on land, at sea, and in space.

More and more soberminded U.S. politicians are becoming aware of the danger of moving the arms race into space.

They are urging the administration not to wreck existing arms control documents; they are urging it to sign new agreements in this field with the Soviet Union. Gerald Smith, former U.S. delegation leader at SALT meetings has said that joint efforts by the USSR and the United States must be directed at reducing, and not creating more complicated and more dangerous offensive arms.

Our country has never spared efforts in this field, but for the United States, using Senator Edward Kennedy's words, the chance of reaching any significant arms control agreement is nil as long as President Reagan insists in progress in the deployment of the star wars systems.

Ignores West European Views

LD082257 Moscow in English to Great Britian and Ireland 1900 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] In his speech in defense of the star wars program, President Reagan said that in no circumstances would the SDI be a subject of arms limitation talks. He stressed the intentions of the United States to complete the development of antimissile space defense and deploy it. What was the response to the suggestion in the United States and what might be the response in Europe? Nikolay Borin:

[Begin recording] When the bill on the military budget was put to vote in Washington, star wars were sharply criticized. Both senators and congressmen feared that loyalty to the SDI (?amounts to) the refusal of the White House to hold serious disarmament talks. Many of them were alarmed by the fact that instead of discussing and seeking a compromise, the Reagan administration excluded key questions of the East-West balance of force from the agenda of the talks. Senator Kennedy said that, while President Reagan insisted on advancement to the deployment of the star wars system, the chances of any notable arms control agreement were equal to zero. Senator Albert Gore said if we want an agreement there has to be some trade off between arms control and cost in weapons. Though there has been no official statement in Western Europe in Reagan's speech yet, I think most American allies in Europe share this viewpoint of the senators. [end recording]

But according to a number of reports from Washington, President Reagan offered a star wars compromise in a confidential response to disarmament proposals for Mikhail Gorbachev.

[Begin Borin recording] Well a close look at these reports show that there was actually no offer of a compromise. The President still speaks of deploying arms in space, only now he says that the deployment will take place in 7 years' time. THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR has remarked that the proposed postponement is not a concession to Moscow because, in any case, the USA won't be able to station such a system ever. General Abrahamson, heading the SDI has said that at least 10 years will pass before the United States will be able to start stationing (?its missiles). So a true compromise was actually put forward by Moscow when (?suggesting) limiting work under the SDI program to laboratory research and agreeing to abide by antiballistic missile treaty for a t least 15 years. [end recording]

Senator Sam Nunn, senior Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee, said that to declare now an intention to deploy the system means to ignore questions that the President raised in his own national security directive. The directive said that the SDI was a research program which had to be proved cost effective, survivable and technically feasible. Not only the senator, but also the allies who agreed to participate in the SDI, stressed that it was a research program, didn't they?

[Begin Borin recording] West European terms of supporting the SDI were formulated for the first time by Prime Minister Thatcher in December 1984, during her visit to the United States. And the main condition was to draw a line between research and deployment that should become a subject of negotiations and could not be carried out without the consent of the opposite side. However, in his speech at the White House meeting with the star wars support group, President Reagan fully ignored this stand of Britain. [end recording]

VASILEV DECRIES COST, METHODS OF U.S. STEALTH PROGRAM

PM081401 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent G. Vasilyev report under the rubric "Behind the Scenes": "The 'Furtive' Bomber"]

[Text] New York, 6 Aug -- The "Stealth" bomber invariably figures among the sinister arsenal of sophisticated types of arms whose production is being started up by the American administration. The word "stealth" means "sly," "furtive," "like a thief."

According to the Pentagon's plans, because of its configuration and because of being equipped with every possible electronic device, this plane will be imperceptible on radar screens, which will enable it to penetrate enemy territory "like a thief in the night."

Life will undoubtedly once again thwart the calculations of those who cherish the impossible dream of wrecking the military-strategic parity and forging ahead through technical innovations. But the Stealth bomber has already justified its name, without having come into service. It is cleaning out the Americans' purses, and doing this in a truly furtive way, like a thief in the night.

As the press here writes, appropriations for the Stealth bomber are "invisible" in every sense. Even the congressmen and senators examining the new U.S. military budget do not know what resources are allocated to the program and how much the militarists' new "toy" will cost. These figures are concealed from the legislators on the pretext that the work is top secret. In Pentagonese, such programs are called "black." In voting for the new budget, the members of Congress can only rack their brains over the meaning of poetical titles like "hazel branch" and "dreamland," which cover up such programs.

The quantity and volume of coded military programs is rapidly growing. Whereas in the present administration's 1st year appropriations for such programs totaled $892 million, in the budget for fiscal 1987 they will amount to $8.6 billion. Theoretically, all this takes place in the interests of military secrecy. In fact the "invisible programs" have become one method by which the U.S. military-industrial complex gets funds out of the Congress.

As for the Stealth bomber, despite its "invisibility" and secrecy, its cost has become known. According to Congressman M. Synar from Oklahoma, each new Pentagon machine will cost the Americans $600 million -- twice what the long-range B-1B bomber, now in production, costs.

PENTAGON MAINTAINS CLOAK OF SECRECY ON F-19 CRASH

LD091356 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0902 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] San Francisco, 9 Aug (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Ustimenko reports:

A huge black spot of burnt soil -- this is all that reminds one of the recent catastrophe in the mountains of the district of Kern in California where the Pentagon's highly secret aircraft F-19 (Lat) had an accident and crashed. For almost 1 month the region was being combed by special detachments of the Air Forces that gathered up and took away all debris. Only after that had been done were the sentries and patrols that formme a cordon removed. The authorities took every measure to ensure that the world did not learn about what had happened in this place.

At the Pentagon they refuse to even acknowledge the very fact of the existence of the F-19 fighter, which, according to press information, is constructed in such a manner as to make it as difficult as possible to discover by radar, and is intended for carrying out "special operations" above the territory of other countries. It has also become known that this type of aircraft has been developed for 10 years now. The funds for the program come from the Pentagon's secret budget, noted the television company NBC. The U.S. military department is taking every possible measure in order to surround its operations with a cloak of secrecy, perhaps the densest since the creation of the atomic bomb, NBC emphasized.

According to a report by the news agency UPI, the findings of the commission carrying out research into the catastrophe in Kern "will never be made public."

U.S. DISPLEASURE WITH ISRAEL SEEN AS PROPAGANDA

LD090901 Moscow TASS in English 0646 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS -- TASS commentator Mikhail Krutikhin writes:

Washington got "angry": Reports appeared in the press that Israeli agents secretly obtained in the USA a technology for the manufacture of cluster bombs -- a barbarous weapon which is used for mass annihilation of people. The peals of the "anger" thundered at the top of the Capitol Hill -- in Congress which demanded an inquiry into the incident. Less than half a year passed, and the "grand jury' of the U.S. Supreme Court supoenaed eight Israelis involved in the illegal export of the secret technology. The thunder died away. It became known in Tel Aviv that the Americans withdrew the supoenaes because, they said, Israel showed readiness for cooperation in the inquiry. Judging by everything, this minor incident in relations between the "strategic partners" will end in the same way as the notorious "case of Pollard" -- an Israeli spy who was uncovered in the States. The conflict will be, doubtless, settled peacefully.

Confidence in such an outcome is also confirmed by pronoucements mady by U.S. Vice-President George Bush during his latest visit to Tel Aviv. The ranking U.S. emissary stated Washington's readiness to grant the "most favoured status" to Israel in the military filed. This step, which will formally equate Israel with the USA's NATO partners, will give the Zionist military a reliable access -- and a cheaper one, too -- to the latest "achievements" of the U.S. military-industrial complex. It may appear that U.S. leaders' right hand does not know what the left one is doing. Some people expose and try to catch Israeli spies and the stealers of military technology while others themselves provide Israel with those secrets which Tel Aviv agents did not have time to steal. But in actual fact, there is no contradiction in this respects, the U.S.-Israeli alliance is based on such a solid platform as a common striving to suppress the struggle for freedom, independent and for the progressive development of the peoples of the Middle East. Suffice it to recall how Israeli planes had dropped cluster bombs on Lebanese towns and villages and how Americans did the same in Libya. The common goals and common methods prove that the fuss over the Israelis' "untentlemanly" conduct in the United States is neither more nor less than a propaganda trick designed to hoodwink the public opinion.

KYODO REPORTS SOVIET NUCLEAR EXPORT PROPOSAL

OW101043 Tokyo KYODO in English 1034 GMT 10 Aug 86

[Text] Beijing, Aug. 10 KYODO -- The Soviet Union has proposed the export of its nuclear power generating facilities to China, Eastern block sources said here Sunday [10 Aug].

Whether China has already made a decision on the introduction of the Soviet-made facilities remains unknown. But the sources said that China is very interested in the Soviet proposal and that the two countries have agreed to continue discussions on cooperation in nuclear power generation.

According to the sources, the Soviet proposal was made when a Chinese delegation visited the Soviet Union between June and July to study atomic power generating facilities at various locations and exchange views on bilateral cooperation in nuclear energy.

The visit of the delegation, headed by Huang Yicheng, vice minister of the State Planning Commission, was said to have been proposed by the Soviet Union in March when the two countries held a meeting in Beijing on bilateral cooperation in the areas of econonics, trade and science and technology.

The sources said that the Chinese delegation was briefed by Soviet officials on the April 26 Chernobyl nuclear plant accident in the Ukraine.

DIRECTOR INTERVIEWED AS TRADE EXHIBIT CLOSES

LD110328 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Aug 86

[Text] Today the PRC trade and economic exhibition at Sokolniki, Moscow, came to an end. Our correspondent Vladimir Savchenko reports:

[Begin recording] [Savchenko] The exhibition enjoyed great popularity with Muscovites and guests of the capital. From 25 July more than 300,000 visitors toured it. Particular interest was aroused by the consumer goods, of which there was a broad display at the exhibition, the artful wares of skilled craftsmen, and the fashion shows. A concluding interview with the director of the exhibition Xie Qianchun:

[Xie Qianchun in Chinese with superimposed Russian translation] I should like to express sincere gratitude to the All-Union Association Eksporttsentr of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry and other Soviet organizations for their great support and assistance during the holding of our exhibition. During its running we were visited by delegations of leaders from Soviet ministries and foreign trade organizations. There were many meetings and talks with Soviet specialists from various industries. I think the experience of holding this exhibition will be reflected in talks between governmental delegations of China and Soviet Union on economic, trade and scientific, and technical cooperation.

As for the Soviet people that visited our exhibition, we are sincerely moved by the great interest they have shown for our exposition and the warmth and consideration they treated us with. We believe our work here will play an important role in increasing mutual understanding between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union.

Soon we shall return home and take part in the organizing of a commerce and industry exhibition of the Soviet Union which will be conducted in Beijing in December this year. We are all sure that the Soviet exhibition will be very successful, as ours has been in Moscow. [end recording]

COMMENTARY OPTIMISTIC ON RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV

OW082150 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Shakov commentary]

[Text] For people in the Asian and Pacific region, the question of safeguarding and strengthening peace is especially urgent. Since World War II, more military conflicts have taken place in Asia -- The largest continent in the world -- than on any other continent. There have been two major wars, the Korean War and the Vietnam War. To seek hegemony, U.S. imperialism had planned to use nuclear weapons in these wars. It was only because of Soviet warnings that the U.S. aggressors did not attack Korea, China, and Vietnam with nuclear bombs.

It should be pointed out that the Asian and Pacific region is not peaceful today. Washington is stepping up its undeclared war against the Afghan and Cambodian peoples. It stores nuclear weapons on its Asian bases. According to estimates of Western experts, the United States has deployed 10,000 nuclear warheads in this region. At the same time, it is building its naval and air power in the Pacific and speeding the militarization of Japan, South Korea, Pakistan, and Thailand. Under these circumstances, developing Soviet-Chinese relations is especially important. The two countries share the world's longest border. Our children and grandchildren will live near each other forever. History entrusted the Soviet and Chinese peoples with an extremely important mission. Much in international development depends on our two major socialist nations.

In his speech at Vladivostok, Comrade Gorbachev expressed satisfaction with the noticeable improvement in relations between the two countries in recent years. He emphatically pointed out: the Soviet Union is prepared -- any time, and at any level -- to discuss with China questions of additional measures for creating an atmosphere of goodneighborliness.

Comrade Gorbachev said: We hope the border dividing -- I would prefer to say linking -- us will become a border of peace and friendship in the near future. Our two peoples have many things in common. We have similar priorities -- those of accelerating social and economic development. Cooperation between our two countries will contribute to the development of our national economies and open up new prospects. Recent progress in economic relations between the two countries is a good sign. The road to bilateral cooperation has been opened. For instance, the Amur region can become an area whose resources can be jointly developed.

The Soviet Union is different from Tsarist Russia. It is willing to officially recognize the main stream of the Amur River as the border between the two countries. The Soviet Union has suggested cooperation with China in space exploration, which could include training Chinese cosmonauts. Undoubtedly there are great opportunities for cooperation in the spheres of science, culture, and education.

We can expect a response from the Chinese side to the Soviet proposals, which will lay foundation for a fundamental improvement in the relations between the two countries.

'REALISTIC' GORBACHEV SPEECH SEEKS BETTER TIES

OW100750 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Mulatov commentary: "Realistic Prospects for Strengthening Peace in Asia"]

[Text] The opinions and suggestions Comrade Gorbachev put forward in his 28 July speech in Vladivostok have received the close attention of political and social activists in all Asian countries. This has been reported by the Chinese press. Commenting on the reactions of political activists of various countries to the Soviet proposal, RENMIN RIBAO said that some welcome the Soviet attitude, others are taking precautions, and still others are taking a wait-and-see and act-according-to-circumstances attitude.

At present many people would like to know what China's attitude is toward the Soviet Union's constructive attitude, the question of Soviet-China relations, and the issue of radically improving the international situation in the Asian-Pacific region as a whole.

Our country does not conceal it attaches great importance to Soviet-China relations. I think many people are now aware that the solution of a large number of international issues depends on us, the two largest socialist countries. The Soviet Union is willing to hold meetings with China at any time and at any level to discuss the question of taking extra [e wai] measures to create a goodneighborly atmosphere and carve a bright future for further improvement of Soviet-China relations and for their cooperation in the international arena.

Reports from Beijing say that Chinese leading organs are now carefully studying all Soviet suggestions directly related to China. A few days ago, a spokesman of the Information Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said: The Chinese side thinks Gorbachev's Vladivstok speech contains some fresh views on the improvement of Soviet-China relations. We are studying this speech. He also said that China and the Soviet Union have been holding dialogues at a certain level.

Listeners, the Soviet Union constantly pursues the line of carrying out constructive and effective cooperation with all Asian-Pacific countries. Now is the time to integrate this region into plans for establishing a comprehensive system of international security.

The Soviet proposals accords with this objective and is conducive to preventing the proliferation and increase of nuclear arms and to reducing to a great extent the number of armed forces and conventional weapons in the Asian-Pacific region. Our country believes the time is ripe for discussing questions of launching confidence-building measures and ensuring nonuse of force in this region. To this end, it has been suggested that an international conference be held in a Soviet coastal city.

There are realistic prospects for strengthening peace in the Asian-Pacific region. As Gorbachev pointed out, our views on security in the Asian-Pacific region do not come from thin air, but take account of the experiences of the past and of modern times.

CPC RURAL CELL REGULARIZATION PROGRAM NOTED

PM080748 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Aug 86 Sole Edition p 3

[TASS report: "China: About Rural Party Cells"]

[Text] Beijing, 1 Aug -- XINHUA reports preparations to carry out party regularization at the level of rural party cells, which unite approximately half the CPC members -- 20 million people -- have begun in the Chinese countryside. This important political measures will be developed throughout the country from the end of this year.

Chief attention is now on studying tasks and methods of regularization, as well as the chief CPC Central Committee documents on this question.

REPORTAGE ON GORBACHEV MEETING WITH JCP'S FUWA

Meeting Postponed Twice

OW090145 Tokyo KYODO in English 0139 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow, Aug 9 KYODO -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has twice postponed scheduled meetings with a visiting Japanese Communist Party delegation, delegation sources said Friday. The sources said the delegation was asked by its Soviet hosts not to divulge the reason of the postponement but ruled out that Gorbachev may be facing political trouble at home.

"The reason (for the postponement) was not political. Beyond that, I have no comment at this time," the sources told Japanese reporters who travelled to Moscow with the delegation. The delegation, which arrived in Moscow on Monday, is headed by Japan Communist Party Chairman Tetsuzo Fuwa. The delegation was originally scheduled to meet with the Soviet leader on Wednesday, and the meeting was first postponed until Friday or Saturday due to what the Soviet hosts described as "unforeseen circumstances," delegation sources said.

On Friday, the delegation was again told by Soviet party officials that the Gorbachev meeting could not take place on Saturday, the sources said. Delegation sources said they had promised their Soviet hosts not to disclose the reason for the delay when the first postponement was made but they demanded that they be allowed to tell the press after the second postponement was requested. The Soviets, however, urged them not to, the sources said. Delegation sources said the delegation may return home if the scheduled meeting with Gorbachev cannot take place soon.

Gorbachev 'Resting Due to Cold'

OW091247 Tokyo KYODO in English 1233 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow, Aug 9 KYODO -- Soviet party leader Mikhail Gorbachev has been resting due to a cold he got after a trip to the Far Eastern part of the country late last month, Japan Communist Party (JCP) sources said here Saturday. The 55-year-old leader has twice put off a meeting with a visiting JCP delegation led by Chairman Tetsuzo Fuwa, and no reason has been previously given, according to the sources. Soviet hosts asked JCP officials not to divulge the reason for the postponement but denied Gorbachev is in political trouble at home. Instead, Fuwa will meet Politburo member Yegor Ligachev Monday afternoon (local time), the KCP sources said.

Gorbachev Begins Talks

OW111149 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1010 GMT 11 Aug 86

[Text] The regular JCP-CPSU meeting, which had been postponed for 1 week, began in Moscow at 1100 [Moscow time: 0700 GMT] on 11 August. General Secretary Gorbachev, who was originally thought to be absent due to his cold, attended the meeting in person and held talks with Chairman Fuwa.

[Begin recorded report by Moscow correspondent Hideki Yamada] The JCP delegation headed by chairman Fuwa arrived in Mowcow on 4 August. It had been kept waiting for over a week for the meeting with General Secretary Gorbavchev. The meeting was held at long last.

General Secretary Gorbachev was reportedly to be absent from the talks since he had lost his voice due to his cold. However, General Secretary Gorbachev attended the meeting in person. Accompanied by Secretary Ligachev, the party's no. 2 man, he greeted Chairman Fuwa and his party.

When Chairman Fuwa asked him about his cold at the beginning of the talks, Gorbachev answered that he had not completely got over his cold, but added that he thought he would get well soon. Touching on his visit to Japan, General Secretary Gorbachev said that he was happy to visit Japan in response to the invitation he received, but that the Japanese side may still have to make preparations for his visit. At the present regular meeting, the two sides will exchange views on the implementation of the joint communique on the abolition of nuclear weapons since its adoption by the JCP and the CPSU in December 1984. At the talks, the Soviet side will state its views on the U.S.-USSR negotiations, including the U.S.-USSR summit talks, and also on the nuclear arms ban, while Chairman Fuwa and his party will state their views on how they think the international antinuclear and peace campaign should be carried out and on various Soviet proposals concerning nuclear weapons and nuclear tests. Then, discussions will be held separately on various issues.

What will be noteworthy at the current talks is that General Secretary Gorbachev may have something to say about the extension of the moratorium on nuclear tests because the moratorium which had been in effect for over 1 year expired on 6 August. In addition, attention will be centered on the timing of General Secretary Gorbachev's visit to Japan. It is expected that the contents of the talks will be disclosed today, 11 August. [end recording]

MONGOLIAN STATEMENT WELCOMES GORBACHEV SPEECH

LD071929 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT 7 Aug 86

[Text] New York August 7 TASS -- A statement issued by the government of the Mongolian People's Republic has been circulated at the U.N. Headquarters as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly. In the statement the Mongolian Government gives a high appraisal of the constructive initiatives proposed in the speech delivered in Vladivostok by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The Government of Mongolia holds that these large-scale proposals open up a real way to dialogue and cooperation between the states of the region and to security in the whole of Asia and the Pacific Ocean area, the document emphasises. The convocation of a conference of Pacific Ocean countries suggested by the Soviet Union as well as the holding of a conference on confidence-building measures and on non-use of force in the region would become practical steps towards shaping such security.

Mongolia regards the Soviet Government's decision to bring home a certain part of the Soviet military contingent, sent to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan at the request of the Afghan Government, as an important political step aimed at speeding up a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, the statement says. It is natural that such a settlement would depend on complete cessation of the armed intervention against the DRA and on the prevention of interference from the outside in the affairs of the sovereign Afghan state. The Mongolian Government is stating that the current consideration by the Mongolian and Soviet sides of the question of bringing home a considerable part of Soviet troops from Mongolia is to contribute to all-Asia and Pacific-Ocean security and serves the cause of building confidence and strengthening goodneighbourly relations in Asia, the statement points out.

TASS REPORTS ON INDIA'S GANDHI'S MOSCOW STOPOVER

LD110955 Moscow TASS in English 0934 GMT 11 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 11 TASS -- Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi made a short stop over in Moscow after his plane had developed an engine trouble on a flight from Mexico City to New Delhi.

The Indian prime minister was welcomed at the airport by Geydar Aliyev, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and a first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. They had a conversation of a cordial and friendly nature on Soviet-Indian relations and some international problems.

Rajiv Gandhi and the persons accompanying him left Moscow for New Delhi on a special plane provided by the Soviet Government.

SHEVARDNADZE, DRA'S DOST DISCUSS TROOP WITHDRAWAL

PM111049 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

["Friendly Talk" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] On 9 August, Comrade Shevardnadze met Comrade Dost, member of PDPA Central Committee and DRA Minister of Foreign Affairs, who was returning from Geneva after the end of the second stage of the seventh round of Afghan-Pakistani talks on the political settlement of the situation regarding Afghanistan. In the course of a friendly conversation the ministers exchanged views on matters relating to such a settlement and stressed that its most rapid achievement would meet the interests of ensuring peace in the region of Asia and would make a significant contribution to improving the overall international situation. It was noted that a reliable base for this is being created by the decision for part of the Soviet contingent of servicemen to return to the USSR from Afgnanistan which was announced by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the speech in Vladivostok.

The sides ascertained that the 29 July address to the Afghan people by PDPA Central Committee General Secretary Najibullah found wide support in Afghanistan and beyond its borders.

DRA 'DEMOCRATIZATION' PROGRESS DISCUSSED

PM081320 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Veniamin Shurygin "Commentator's Column": "Following a Course of Democratization"]

[Text] The second stage of elections to local organs of government is continuing in the DRA. They began last year and have now been held in more than half of the country's 29 provinces.

The creation of local organs of power, to which representatives of different sections of society are elected, the broadening of the revolution's social base are a characteristic feature of the democratization of social life in Afghanistan today. In the course of this extensive process trade union, women's, youth, and other mass organizations have been set up, the National Fatherland Front has been formed, and the Loya Jirgha, (supreme council) and tribal jirghas have been held.

The essence of this process consists in winning over to the revolution those classes, social groups, and patriotically inclined individuals who for one reason or another have not yet welcomed its ideas or have even opposed people's power.

In the course of implementing this policy the composition of the supreme organ of state power -- DRA Revolutionary Council -- has been enlarged considerably, chiefly through an influx of nonparty people. Similar practical steps have also been taken in respect of other state and public organizations. The National Fatherland Front Central Council has been supplemented by representatives of various nationalities. New figures have joined in the work of the Council of Ministers. As Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, pointed out in a recent address to his compatriots, the party is today pursuing a policy of national reconciliation and of broadening the social base of the April National Democratic Revolution, even including setting up a government incorporating political forces that find themselves outside the country but which sincerely seek to participate in the national process of building a new Afghanistan. All this is extremely important under the conditions of the "undeclared war" being waged against the Republic.

Understanding that the aims and tasks of the April Revolution meet the interests of those Afghans who wish their motherland happiness, well-being, and prosperity is increasingly clearly strengthening in very different sections of the country's population. The work now under way in the DRA to broaden the revolution's social base contributes precisely to making Afghans further aware of this truth and to creating favorable conditions throughout Afghan territory for social progress and the democratization of the life of society, and a situation in which disputed questions will be settled together, by peaceful means, in an atmosphere of trust and cooperation.

BAKHTAR CITED ON ACTIONS AGAINST 'BANDITS'

PM081337 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Aug 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Hitting the Dushmans"]

[Text] The DRA Armed Forces have eliminated two mercenary dushman gangs sent into Afghan territory from abroad.

BAKHTAR reports that in the course of the operations, carried out in Ghowr and Baghlan provinces a significant number of mercenaries were eliminated. The weapons and ammunition taken from the dushmans, including missiles, mortars, and large-calibre machineguns, as well as subversive literature, are irrefutable evidence of the bandits' links with Western espionage centers.

KAYSONE PHOMVIHAN ARRIVES FOR VISIT 8 AUG

LD081835 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS -- Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, arrived in the Soviet Union today for a rest at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

IZVESTIYA CITES PHILIPPINE VIEWS ON U.S. BASES

PM081529 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent I. Kovalev report: "Topical Initiatives"]

[Text] Manila -- The newspaper MALAYA has described as "extremely topical" the proposals on strengthening security and cooperation in the Asian and Pacific region put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his Vladivostok speech.

The Soviet proposals are indeed topical for the Philippines. Right now the constitutional commission set up by President Corazone Aquino's government is drafting a new constitution, and heated debates are taking place on including an item on eliminating American military bases on the archipelago in the country's fundamental law. The official agreement on bases is effective until 1991. What then? The pro-American lobby in the Philippines insists on including an item on the bases in the draft constitution, intimidating its opponents with the "Soviet threat."

The supporters of bases claim "an American withdrawal could be followed by the arrival of the Russians," since some kind of "vacuum" would supposedly be formed. The Filipinos themselves answer to false prophets. For instance, THE SUNDAY TIMES writes: "The vacuum theory is a colonialist weapon. They have been using this claim since way back to justify aggression and the enslavement of other countries...More than 100 countries now belong to the Nonaligned Movement, and nothing has happened to them." The purport of the article is that no "vacuum" is to be feared if the country has resolutely chosen the path of independent development.

For Filipinos who had been misled by Western propaganda, the detailed explanations published in MALAYA were a real revelation. They indicate that the conjectures about a "vacuum" are totally at variance with the policy of the USSR, which calls for mutual steps to remove armed activeness and political tension in the Asian and Pacific region.

The danger which the presence of American military bases on the archipelago's territory represents both for the Filipinos themselves and for tranquility throughout the archipelago is becoming increasingly clear to Philippine political and public circles. These bases, Professor Roland (Simbulan) of the University of the Philippines believes, complicate the situation in the region, which is already packed with Pentagon military facilities.

Things have gone so far that those coming out against American military presence, economic dominance, and political interference in the Philippines include...49 American missionaries, priests and monks from a Christian order operating on the archipelago. Without the American presence, they believe, ordinary Filipinos would not be as poor as they are now.

The Filipinos' interest in the new Soviet proposals on strengthening peace in the Asian-Pacific region is manifested on a wider plane too. Thus much is expected here of the forthcoming meeting of representatives of the 13 countries of the South Pacific forum, which will discuss, in particular, practical problems of transforming this part of the planet into a nuclear-free zone. As is known, the USSR has welcomed the idea of creating such a zone. The conference opens of Friday 8 Aug in the Fijian capital.

Here too there was approval for the Philippine Government's decision to send observers to Harare for the next, eighth summit conference of the Nonaligned Movement.

VLADIMIROV LOOKS AT 'COBRA GOLD' EXERCISE

BK091320 Moscow in Thai to Thailand 1200 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Viktor Vladimirov commentary]

[Text] The Gulf of Thailand is currently full of all kinds of warships and combat planes. Thai and U.S. Marines and commandos are holding landing exercise in Rayong Province. The joint U.S.-Thai military exercise, codenamed "Cobra Gold-86," is in full swing. The Pentagon has been holding these shows of might, all codenamed "Cobra Gold," on a broader and more ambitious scale with an increasingly provocative character each year. This year's exercise involves more troops that any previous year -- 13,000 soldiers and officers, 30 warships, and 3 combat squadrons. The number of soldiers and weapons involved in the exercise already says something, but the fact that it is being held close to the Cambodian border must also be a cause for considerable concern. The Thai border area in question is the hideout of the Pol Pot remnants who often sneak into Cambodia to commit crimes. On this, the Cambodian news agency SPK said that the "Cobra Gold-86" military exercise being held close to the Cambodian border constitutes a threat to Cambodia's security and sovereignty. SPK stressed that the support given to the Pol Pot remnants by the international reactionaries is responsible for the tension around Cambodia.

Another significant feature in this year's U.S.-Thai joint military exercise is the participation of the battleship New Jersey equipped with Tomahawk cruise missiles, the Long Beach equipped with rockets, and the squadron of F-16's with nuclear weapons flown from Kunsan Airbase in South Korea -- a base listed in the Pentagon record of U.S. overseas military bases with nuclear weapons. The Cobra Gold-86" military exercise, under the shadow of nuclear weapons, constitutes a threat to the ASEAN members which wish to declare Southeast Asia a nuclear free zone. According to Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, the drafting of a document to this effect is proceeding well. Moreover, several countries in Southeast Asia have responded favorably to the Soviet Union's latest initiative to hold a conference on turning the Asia-Pacific region into an area of peace and cooperation. Such an idea would certainly not make Washington happy. This is clear from the deployment of U.S. warships and combat planes with nuclear capability for military exercises off the coast of Thailand.

The "Cobra Gold-86" military exercise, moreover, cannot be looked at in isolation. It is evidently part of the new global strategy of Washington, conceived by the White House to legalize its interference in other countries' internal affairs under the pretext of the fight against international terrorism. According to the U.S. paper THE BOSTON GLOBE, this new U.S. global strategy prescribes elimination and suppression of all acts of violence in developing countries. The paper also notes Washington has resorted to numerous methods and factors to emplement the strategy. This includes troop movements, or in other words, armed intervention. The U.S. air raids against Libya were a clear example of this. This kind of maneuver is being rehearsed during the "Cobra Gold-86" military exercise. A large-scale landing exercise, with support form warships and air squadrons which are responsible for smashing enemy defense line, is being held. In fact, a landing exercise by U.S. soldiers invading a certain country in the area is taking place on a beach in Asia.

KONNOV ASSESSES PACIFIC ANTINUCLEAR CONFERENCE

OW081407 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 8 Aug 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast: Viktor Konnov commentary on the conference of Southern Pacific antinuclear organizations in Suva, Fiji]

[Text] Hello comrades. First a short reference: Exactly 1 year ago representatives of 13 states of this region, including Australia, New Zealand, the Cook Islands, Fiji, and others adopted a decision to declare the southern part of the Pacific Ocean a nuclear-free zone. In this vast area, which stretches thousands of kilometers from the equator to Antarctica, from Australia to the shores of South America, the possession, use, stockpiling, and testing of nuclear devices are prohibited -- as is the storage of nuclear waste. This decision is quite natural in view of the fact that the economies of a majority of the countries in this region depend on fishing.

The local people say: The ocean is our breadbasket. Therefore, the islanders are protesting French nuclear tests on Mururoa atoll, which pollutes the ocean, as well as American and Japanese attempts to dump nuclear waste near the islands.

At the conference in the Fijian capital, antinuclear organizations of the southern part of the Pacific Ocean once again demand a stop to the militarization of this region and an end to French nuclear tests in Polynesia. A special report prepared by the organizers of the conference exposes the underhand activities of the CIA, which is attempting to contain the rise of the antinuclear movement in this part of the world.

The Soviet position on this question is well known. It was once again reiterated in the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Vladivostok. Comrade Gorbachev said: We favor placing barriers in the path of the spread and growth of nuclear weapons in Asia and the Pacific Ocean. The USSR supports the announcement of the establishment of the southern part of the Pacific Ocean as a nuclear-free zone and calls on all nuclear powers to guarantee its status, either unilaterally or bilaterally.

'HOODLUMS' STAGE 'PROVOCATION' AT BERLIN WALL

LD101413 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 10 Aug 86

[Text] A mob of rampant hoodlums crossed the GDR state border at Checkpoint Charlie in Berlin on Saturday night. The GDR border guards forced the hoodlums to turn back. The action was the climax of provocations staged in West Berlin to mark the coming 25th anniversary of the GDR measures to strengthen the security of the capital and establish proper controls there. Addressing a recent gathering in West Berlin, the United States ambassador in Federal Germany, Richard Burt, made instigatory statements amounting to interference in GDR's affairs.

DEMICHEV PRESENTS AWARD TO FINNISH COMMUNIST

LD081727 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] In the Kremlin today, Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, presented the Order of Friendship of Peoples to Sinisalo, a prominent figure in the Finnish Communist movement. On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government, Comrade Demichev warmly congratulated Sinisalo on his lofty award, which is in recognition of Sinisalo's contribution toward strengthening friendship between the peoples of Finland and the Soviet Union, and toward the struggle for peace and social progress.

Expressing sincere gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet state, Sinisalo said that he regards the award first and foremost as recognition of the activities of Finland's Communists and their party. He declared that the Soviet Union's initiative and determination to prevent nuclear war and to accomplish the mighty creative tasks set out by the 27th CPSU Congress are a great support and guide for us.

PETROVSKIY HOLDS TALKS WITH TURKISH DELEGATION

LD081520 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 8 TASS -- The Soviet-Turkish consultations were held in the USSR Foreign Ministry on Thursday. The sides exchanged opinions on a broad range of questions of international security put on the agenda of the coming 41st session of the U.N. General Assembly. The Turkish delegation headed by O. Aksoy, director of the International Political Organizations Department of the Turkish Foreign Ministry, was received by Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR Deputy Foreign Minister.

CHIKIN DELEGATION RETURNS FROM SAN MARINO

PM081342 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Return Home"]

[Text] The CPSU delegation headed by V.V. Chikin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, which traveled to San Marino at the invitation of the San Marino Communist Party Central Committee, has returned to Moscow.

U.S., ISRAEL HINDERING SYRIAN MIDEAST ROLE

LD081703 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1430 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Aleksandr Timoshkin commentary]

[Text] When I read the details of the news conference held by U.S. Vice President George Bush in Cairo, my attention was drawn to a point that throws more light on the true objectives of Washington's Middle East policy. One concludes from George Bush's remarks that Washington wants to exclude Syria from the search for ways and means to resolve the Middle East conflict.

George Bush said we -- of course he meant the present U.S. Administration -- have not included Syria among the participants in the international conference on the Middle East. He then said: Peace can be achieved in the area without Syria's participation. Bush pointed to history and referred to the notorious Camp David accords -- that in fact it was possible to conclude the accords without the participation of Syria and also without the participation of the overwhelming majority of the other Arab states which to this day continue to reject the policy of separate agreements and the shameful collusion at Camp David.

Syria is the most decisive and consistent in its rejection. It is also seeking to galvanize the Arab world into more actively shunning the U.S.-Israeli Camp David policy.

The normalization of Syrian-Jordanian relations can be viewed from such an angle. However, such a process conflicts with the plans of Washington and Tel Aviv. Bush said in Cairo that a Jordanian-Israeli meeting does not require Syria's participation. One can clearly see behind such views Washington's desire to politically isolate Syria as one of the principal obstacles in the so-called peace process in the Middle East -- according to the U.S. view, of course.

There is also the U.S. desire to depict the matter as though Syria is not directly concerned with the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. If this is the case, what is the situation with regard to the return of the Golan Heights to Syria? That is one of the most important conditions for the establishment of a just and durable peace in the area. If the United States should try to disregard such a condition that can only mean that it recognizes the legality of the Tel Aviv decision to annex the Syrian Golan Heights.

It is also significant that Washington viewed the provocative exercises by the Israeli Army in the Golan Heights as a normal matter. The exercises were held during the U.S. vice president's stay in the Middle East. According to experts, the exercises were the biggest held in recent times. Israeli soldiers rehearsed a wide-scale offensive and tested coordination among all the services of the Israeli army, particularly the air force and tanks. The exercises were held amid hostile remarks made by Israeli generals and senior civilian officials.

Ladies and gentlemen, we face a multisided campaign of blatant provocations against Syria. The two strategic allies are trying to dissuade Syria from continuing its active struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression and to restore genuine justice to the area, primarily by political means. However, such attempts -- like many similar attempts in the past -- are doomed to failure. Syria has the necessary strength to repulse aggression. Syria's influence in all Middle Eastern affairs continues to be great, whether Washington and Tel Aviv like it or not.

Thank you and peace be upon you.

SUDANESE MINISTER VIEWS FOREIGN, DOMESTIC ISSUES

LD091421 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] Cairo August 9 TASS -- Sudan is traditionally linked by friendly relations with the Soviet Union. One of the first actions of the coalition government formed after the recent elections was the decision on a further development of relations with the USSR. A proof of that is the forthcoming visit to Moscow of Sudan's Prime Minister al-Sadiq al-Mahdi. Moscow will be the first capital outside the African Continent to be visited by the current Sudanese head of government. A statement to this effect has been made in an interviewww with soviet newsmen by Sudan's Minister of Information and Culture Muhammad Tawfiq Ahmed who is currently on a visit here.

The USSR, he said, gave us economic, technical and other assistance in the past too. The forthcoming visit of S. al-Mahdi to the Soviet Union will make it possible to outline prospects for the development of cooperation between our countries in various fields -- in industry, agriculture and culture.

M.T. Ahmed stressed the important positive role played by the Soviet Union in many international events. I wish to remind, he added, the invariable support given by the USSR to the Nonaligned Movement. True nonalignment is unthinkable without strong ties with the socialist countries. This is demanded by the principles of the movement: the fight for peace and justice, for independence and social progress, for the freedom and equality of all peoples of the world. These are the principles, which are also firmly followed by Sudan.

Touching upon the Middle East crisis the Sudanese minister said that its settlement as a whole and the settlement of the Palestinian problem, in particular, is possible only within the framework of an international conference with the participation of all sides concerned, including PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people and the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council. As far as the separate talks are concerned, they cannot bring the Arabs the long awaited peace and security, even if one of the great powers -- the USA participates in them, M.T. Ahmed said.

Characterising the situation in Sudan, he said that as a result of the anti-people's policy of former President Numayri the country found itself in a very difficult position. We have inherited from the Numayri regime the huge debt of 13 billion dollars to the USA and the West, economic dislocation and disastrous position of the mass of the people.

The government is now preparing a "black paper" -- the list of the crimes perpetrated by Numayri against Sudan. He is to be tried by the people and punished according to his deserts.

M.T. Ahmed also said that the cabinet headed by S. al-Mahui is making efforts to resolve all problems facing the country. The main of them remain ensuring national unity and settling the problem of southern Sudan. The first step in that direction has already been done. The frank dialogue between Al-Sadiq al-Mahdi and John Garang, leader of the south Sudanese insurgents, which was held in Addis Ababa the other day, can be viewed as an introduction to a broad discussion of all vital problems at the constitutional conference which is scheduled to held in October 1986. Representatives of all political parties, organisations and forces, tribes and nationalities inhabiting the country are to be invited for it, Sudan's information minister said.

EGYPT'S GHALI 'APPROVES' MIDEAST INITIATIVE

LD080353 Moscow TASS in English 0340 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] Cairo August 7 TASS -- Egypt approves of the Soviet Union's proposals for convening an international conference to resolve the Middle East crisis and for the setting up of a preparatory committee consisting of the five prominent members of the Security Council, said State Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Arab Republic of Egypt Butrus Ghali. This step can help overcome the stalemate in the situation in the region, Butrus Ghali said in an interview to the Arab weekly AL-WATAN AL-'ARABI which appears in Paris.

With regard to the Soviet-Egyptian relations, Butrus Ghali said that they are developing and deepening, particularly in the commercial and economic sphere. He said the Soviet Union gives assistance in the consolidation of the economy of the Arab Republic of Egypt, which he saw during his latest visit to Moscow.

The Egyptian minister of state for foreign affairs said that Egypt attaches much importance to the strengthening of ties with African countries that play an important role in the Nonaligned Movement. He criticized the West's attempts to split African countries. This split meets the interests of foreign monopolies, Butrus Ghali said.

He said that Egypt presses for an end to the Iran-Iraq conflict and its settlement at a negotiating table.

ZAMBIA'S KAUNDA PRAISES GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

LD090945 Moscow TASS in English 0635 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] Lusaka August 8 TASS -- President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia has come out in support of the Soviet peace initiatives proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Today, when receiving Anatoliy Adamishin, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, who is visiting here, the president stated that Zambia ardently welcomed the stand taken by the Soviet leadership on matters of peace, he said that this was of immense importance to the Zambians. Anatoliy Adamishin delivered a message to him from Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Zambian president pointed out that small countries and members of the Non-Aligned Movement were aware of the great importance of the Soviet peace initiatives. Unfortunately, he said, some Western leaders are obviously unwilling to accept Soviet proposals and do not want to understand their meaning.

Kenneth Kaunda voiced concern over the deterioration of the situation in the region where the Pretoria regime, with the backing of the West headed by the USA, continues to pursue the policy of apartheid, to persist in the illegal occupation of the territory of Namibia and to commit aggressive acts against neighbouring independent countries.

The Zambian president highly appreciated the state of relations between the Soviet Union and Zambia. We must continue to develop them and jointly to struggle for peace for the good of the whole of mankind, he pointed out.

BRIEFS

ZAMBIAN EDUCATIONAL PROTOCOL -- In the capital of Zambia, Lusaka, a program of cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and Zambia has been signed. It envisages the allocation by the Soviet Union of 35 grants per year to train Zambian national cadres in higher and tertiary educational establishments of the USSR. Soviet teachers will be sent to Zambia to work in tertiary schools and in higher educational establishments. The document places great stress on cooperation in culture, art and sport. Zambian cinematographers will take part in international film festivals in Moscow and Tashkent, and in Zambia, there will be Soviet film weeks. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0204 GMT 9 Aug 86 LD]

CUBAN PARTY DELEGATION MEETS ZAYKOV, OTHERS

LD101435 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 10 Aug 86

[Text] Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee secretariat member Jaime Crombet visited the USSR with a group of party workers from 28 July to 10 August. The Cuban comrades acquainted themselves with the CPSU's experience in managing the economy, intensifying production, and developing the social sphere. They had meetings and conversations with Comrade Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Comrade Yeltsin, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and Moscow Gorkom first secretary; and CPSU Central Committee secretaries Comrade Biryukova and Medvedev. The guests visited industrial enterprises, scientific institutions, and trade utilities and facilities providing domestic services in the Moldavian SSR and in Moscow, acquainted themselves with the work of party and state bodies, and visited CPSU Central Committee departments and Moldavian Communist Party departments.

PRAVDA CITES CHILEAN CP STATEMENT ON U.S. ACTIONS

PM081413 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Aug 8 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Communist Party of Chile Statement"]

[Text] Buenos Aires, 6 Aug -- The U.S. Administration is trying to split the opposition in Chile and isolate leftwing forces with a view to preventing participation by the people's masses in determining the country's future. This is stated in a statement issued in Santiago by the Communist Party of Chile (PCC) Central Committee.

The White House, the document says, is alarmed at the increase in antidictatorial actions and the strengthening of positions of Chilean progressive forces demanding the restoration of democracy. Washington fears development of the domestic political situation in Chile could lead to undesirable consequences for the United States. To avoid this, the PCC Central Committee statement notes, the Reagan administration is trying to knock together a bloc of rightwing opposition parties.

The Pinochet dictatorship will fall, the document stresses, if the people of Chile and all the country's antidictatorial forces strengthen their unity and step up their actions against the hated tyranny. The Pinochet dictatorship must be brought down. Fascism must be eradicated, the PCC Central Committee statement says.

PRESIDIUM EXCHANGES TELEGRAMS WITH VENEZUELA

PM081319 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 86 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent a telegram to President Jaime Lusinchi of Venezuela, sending him sincere congratulations and wishes for happiness and prosperity to the friendly Venezuelan people on the 175th anniversary of the country's proclamation of independence.

In a reply telegram to A.A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the president of Venezuela expressed gratitude for the congratulations.

ACTION TO RECOVER FROM CHERNOBYL LEAK CONTINUES

Ryzhkov, Chebrikov Visit Reactor

LD081817 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] Kiev, 8 Aug (TASS) -- Today Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Viktor Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR State Security Committee, arrived in the Kiev Oblast to acquaint themselves with the progress of the work for the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES.

Nikolay Ryzhkov and Viktor Chebrikov made a trip in a helicopter around the damaged reactor and visited in person the site of the AES where, using modern equipment, complex engineering work is being conducted for mothballing the damaged power set and decontaminating the buildings, equipment, and territory adjoining the station.

N.I. Ryzhkov and V.M. Chebrikov were briefed on the work to entomb the damaged reactor, the preparations for starting up the first and second power sets which are in reserve, and the measures to provide reliable protection for the environment and water resources. These matters were examined at a conference in Chernobyl. Taking part in it were the government commission, now headed by G.G. Vedernikov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; leaders of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee, the Ukraine SSR Government, and party and local Soviet bodies of Kiev Oblast; and military chiefs.

It was noted that the execution of major and vigorous measures had enabled the situation at the AES and the adjacent locality to be considerably improved within a short period. The work is proceeding in an organized manner and on a broad front. Many ministries and departments, scientific, design and planning organizations, hundreds of labor collectives, and military subunits are involved. It was stressed that more effective use must be made of the large forces and resources being allocated to put right the consequences of the accident and to carry out restoration work.

The watch settlement Zelenyy Mys is being set up for the maintenance staff of Chernobyl AES. With its first phase for 588 people, it will be handed over at the end of August. Two-story cottages have already gone up, and these contain everything necessary for the leisure of the power industry workers. Those in charge of the construction site and the designers told N.I. Ryzhkov and V.M. Chebrikov about the progress of the building of the settlement and its prospects. To speed up the works that are to be carried out, it was noted that it will be necessary to develop an independent construction base here and set up a house-building combine, and provide this important project with all the necessary resources.

N.I. Ryzhkov and V.M. Chebrikov inspected the residential buildings intended for the use of the AES shift workers during their time off. Conversations were held with the builders, who gave assurances that they will achieve the task that has been set in a short time and to a high standard.

At a jetty by the settlement of Zelenyy Mys, N.I. Ryzhkov and V.M. Chebrikov inspected the river boats moored there which are being temporarily used for the leisure of the power station shift workers.

They talked to the power station staff and enquired about the way of life and the organization of catering and medical services for the work force. Emphasis was given to the need to provide the power workers with good conditions for work and leisure.

N.I. Ryzhkov and V.M. Chebrikov visited the construction site of the road from Zelenyy Mys to the nuclear power station. They familiarized themselves with the work of the hygiene-and-washing center and the decontamination center for machinery.

In the village of Zdvizhevka, N.I. Ryzhkov and V.M. Chebrikov met the inhabitants who had been evacuated from the Chernobyl area. A modern settlement has been built for them here. The new settlers expressed gratitude to the party and government for their concern and assistance.

[Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 9 August in its "Vremya" in a similar report on this visit at this point adds the following: "Comrades Ryzhkov and Chebrikov were accompanied in their trip round the Chernobyl AES region and Kiev and Gomel Oblast by Comrade Slyunkov, candidate Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; Comrade Lyashko, chairman of the Ukraine SSR Council of Ministers; Comrade Titarenko, second secretary of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee, and other comrades."]

TV Shows Decontamination Work

LD082200 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1310 GMT on 8 August carries a 55-minute documentary program by the Ukrainian Television Film studio entitled "Chernobyl: Two Colors of the Times," which sets out to relate the story so far concerning the accident at the Chernobyl AES with the help of archive film and a commentary read by an unidentified announcer.

The program opens with shots of the town of Pripyat: Women and children stop and chat on the streets; children play in the park; there is a clip of Chernobyl AES, part of which appears to be still under construction. The announcer says that the average age of the inhabitants of Pripyat is 26 years. "Its AES, the Chernobyl AES -- is a convincing embodiment of present-day technological thinking. It was also considered to be one of the cleanest stations from the ecological standpoint. And with the commissioning of the No 5 set it was to have become the most powerful, too," the announcer says, as video shows powerlines at the station and control panels inside it.

He adds: "Then suddenly it happened on the night of 25-26 April. One day was spent determining the scale of the accident. It proved to be considerable, and its consequences were dangerous. It became clear that the foremost task, the most important task, was the people's safety. Preparing and carrying out the evacuation of the population took just 1 day -- another day. And about one week was needed to gain control over the situation at the AES itself. During this most difficult week, which was needed for it to be possible to tell the world something specific, many information centers and other centers indulged in the most unrestrained and unbridled political speculation. At the end of that week Boris Yevdokimovich Shcherbina, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the government commission for the elimination of the consequences of the accident, spoke to journalists." As the announcer speaks the video shows a montage of stills of the damaged power station with superimposed clippings of Soviet press reports, followed by brief clips of Dan Rather on CBS News citing early reports of 2,000 dead. Then the 6 May conference held by Shcherbina is shown.

Shots which, according to the caption, were taken at Borispol airport in Kiev on 8 May, show Blix of the IAEA stepping out of a helicopter, being interviewed on the tarmac, and describing his flight over the damaged plant.

In a clip captioned "Makarov, 9 May," a busload of people are being shown the measures being taken. The announcer says: "Suffice it to say that within 2 hours and 20 minutes on 27 April the town of Pripyat was completely evacuated. Furthermore all those evacuated had careful medical checks." The people are shown talking to women villagers, who tell them that there was no panic and that all went smoothly. Then a clip captioned "Moscow, 15 May" shows Robert Gale giving journalists his impressions of the accident.

A clip captioned "Chernobyl, 17 May" shows Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, identified by the commentary as head of the government commission for the next stage of the work, declaring that the main attention is now being concentrated on putting an end to the danger to people's health arising from the traces of radition.

The next clip, captioned "Pripyat, evening, 24 May 1986," shows a distant shot of the power station 1 month after the accident and the deserted streets and parks of the town -- a town which, in the words of the commentary, had a "population of more then 50,000 people -- men, women and children." A radiation-level checker carrying a portable measuring instrument speaks of the need to help people and about some degree of risk being inherent in any kind of work.

The program continues with a clip captioned "Chernobyl, 25 May" of a building bearing a sign reading: "Ministry of the USSR Coal Industry: Headquarters." The announcer says this is where the strategy for the offensive against the consequences of the accident is being worked out. "A house on the main street is occupied by a union republican ministry; alongside the raykom is the mission of the Ukrainian Council of commission. At different stages it has been headed by and has included some of the most authoritative representatives of science and senior staff of the state apparatus: Academician Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Lev Alekseyevich Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers." This point, the announcer says, marks the beginning of a new stage, moving from defense to the offensive.

The video shows radiation-measurement workers at work inside the 30-km zone. They walk down a long staircase which, according to the commentary, takes them below ground level into the bunker beneath the administrative and everyday affairs block of the AES. Inside the bunker the video shows about a dozen two-tier bunk beds, of which only the lower beds seem to be in use, and a group of white-coated workers playing chess and reading. The camera goes through this room into an adjoining one equipped as an office with desks, telephones, and other equipment, and maps. The commentator says: This is where decisions are instantly turned into action."

There follows a clip captioned "No 4 set, assembly area, 1000." "it takes 3-4 minutes to reach this area from the bunker, traveling by armored transport vehicle." The video shows an armored transport vehicle heading for the assembly area, which can be seen to be close to a damaged section of the power station building. Earth-moving equipment moves about the area. The clip switches back to the bunker, where it focuses on Major-General (Vitaliy Arkadyevich Goldin) who, the commentary says, "coordinates links between science and the Army, and the maximum provision of safety." Profiled, too, is duty operational officer (Vitaliy Nikolayevich Melnikov), seen seated at a desk, speaking into a telephone. "He takes his turn on duty for 24 hours -- 1,440 minutes, during each of which some piece of information comes in."

[A clip captioned: "Ground level, mining drift, 1330" shows rail trucks being pushed by hand from underground. They are full of soil which is tipped out in the open air. The trucks are returned to the drift where they are filled once again as excavation work proceeds. The clip shows supports being put into place inside the tunnel. A long stretch of tunnel is shown completed. The tunnel is lined with supports and lit by lamps. There are cables running along the tunnel walls and a rail track along the floor. The announcer says: "Half the distance has been covered. The radiation situation prevents this corridor from being made wider. When the whole way has been completed the very latest mechanisms will be conveyed along this drift, and they will later be assembled in a widened working area. With their help an enormous vestibule will be created beneath the bottom. Concrete will enter this, a reliable cushion beneath the stricken reactor."

The video shows further shots of the mining activities and profiles the man in charge. "(Viktor Fedorovich Shatalin), chief engineer of the No. 13 mine-building directorate from Donbass, is responsible for the whole tunneling operation." More pictures are shown of the mining operatives. "The shift lasts for 3 hours. The plan is for 13 meters per shift, 12 rings. They deliver more....Fifteen minutes -- 1.5 meters."

The next clip is captioned: "Bunker, recreation room, 1500." We see workers talking there, one of whom is introduced as (Venyamin Aleksandrovich Pryanishnikov), who is to go beneath the reactor.

This is followed by a clip captioned "Helicopter pad, 1700." Video shows a helicopter hovering over the pad and another helicopter, on the ground, being serviced. On the ground, too, are shown piles of lead ingots tied together in a kind of harness from which they were to be dropped into the reactor's crater. There are also sacks which, the announcer says, contain lead pellets. The commentary continues: "But now it is decontamination work, sector by sector, square by square, meter by meter." The clip shows a helicopter releasing an unspecified brown powder over a wooded area and then over a warehouse-like structure.

The program continues with a clip captioned "Chernobyl, House of Culture, 2000," which shows preparations being made for a stage-show, then the actual performance before an audience which consists almost entirely of men.

The next clip captioned "Chernobyl, 26 May" shows decontamination work being carried out at houses by workmen who wash down the outsides of the buildings with hoses. A clip captioned "Village of Cherevach, 0930" shows radiation measurement work being carried out in the countryside.

This is followed by a clip captioned: "AES No. 4 set, 1115". The clip starts with a close shot of the damaged part of the power station building. The clip appears to be taken by someone running down a long corridor. As the camera advances down the corridor still photographs are superimposed, each bearing a name: N.N. Titenok, N.V. Vashchuk, V.P. Pravik, V.I. Ignatenko, V.I. Tishchura, V.K. Kibenok.

[The next clip captioned "AES, 1200" shows workmen in white overalls walking through corridors at the power station. An additional caption says "point: "0.75", [barbatyer] of the No. 4 set, 1230" video shows torches and drilling equipment being used to penetrate a wall. The announcer says: "Behind this wall which is many meters thick is the reactor. Placing instruments in it, or rather sensors with cables leading away to the instruments of the No. 3 set, will make it possible to know rather than guess at the true state of the reactor.

This place, beneath the reactor, is called the bubbler pound or the bubbler bottom, but no matter what it is called, it is beneath the reactor itself. Behind that wall is a high level of radiation. But it is essential to get through to that place in order to rule out the unexpected." The video dwells on the cutting operations. The camera then profiles (Anatoliy Vasilyevich Shevchenko), head of the Ukr-Energo-Mekhanizatsiya directorate, and Aleksandr Pavlovich Faloleyev, deputy head of the Energo-Mekhanizatsiya trust from Moscow.

This is followed by a clip captioned "Bunker, 1500." The clip shows officials talking in the quiet room of the bunker about the sensors which are to be installed on the reactor on the following day. One of the officials is Pryanishnikov, mentioned earlier; another is (Yevgeniy Andreyevich Borodavko), head of a workshop for thermal automatic measurement equipment; another is (Semen Ilich Borondeyn), a leading specialist from a nuclear research institute; and Valeriy Ivanovich Shakhovtsov, deputy director of the Institute of Physics of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences. The announcer says: "Now that the situation is being fully controlled it is important to discover with absolute accuracy the true state of the reactor. The level of radiation there on the other side of the wall beneath the reactor makes it possible for a man to be there for no more than 1-2 minutes. And the engineer Pryanishnikov will be the first to go in there tomorrow."

While a clip captioned "Chernobyl-Kopachi Highway, 1730" taken through the windscreen of a moving vehicle shows army trucks moving along the road in the opposite direction, apparently in a long convoy, the announcer remarks: "What has happened has taught us a great deal. No textbook, no theory can take into account human error. Not deliberate, not out of malice, purely because of irresponsibility and negligence, purely because of ill-discipline, purely because of a whole series of crude violations of the operating regulations, as was stated directly and unambiguously in the conclusions of the government commissin. How enormous in terms of material and ecological losses is the price that will have to be paid for this. And what is much more terrible, how many human lives have been lost. We know perfectly well that mankind cannot manage without new sources of energy. But we have also convinced ourselves of this fact, that complicated technological systems, where the likelihood of an accident is less than with simple ones, but where the consequences of an accident are more serious, require a high, no, the very highest standards of labor." Video shows trucks moving along the highway, undergoing controls at a roadside checkpoint. Their number-plates are said to represent "all the geographical regions of the country." The announcer comments: "The checkpoints have an added significance. How many residents have to be restrained in their understandable desire to check on their homes? It is understandable, but as yet impossible."

A clip captioned "Radiation measurement control point, 2300" shows trucks being halted on the road and checked with portable instruments. This is followed by a clip captioned "Chernobyl, 27 May" showing soldiers washing in the open air, buildings and streets being hosed down. Another clip caption "Headquarters of the Spets-Atom-Energo-Montazh, 0800" shows officials discussing the radiation situation and traffic arrangements. The commentary and the clip single out (Yevgeniy Mikhaylovich Sergeyev), who is responsible for the work of the radio-controlled equipment used in creating safe conditions around the No 4 set. Video shows metallic structures being unloaded which will form part of the protective concrete wall to be erected around the stricken reactor. The clip profiles (Petr Sergeyevich Temirov), director of the Kiev Atom Energo-Stroy-Proyekt Institute, where the structures for the protective wall were planned. The following clip captioned "AES, 1200" shows men dressing for the job of placing the sensors in position. (Viktor Ivanovich Gavrilyuk), deputy director of the institute of Nuclear research of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, was in charge of the final preparations before the sensors were installed," the announcer informs viewers. A clip captioned "Point '9.2', crossing to the No 3 set, 1500" shows men walking along a corridor.

Another clip captioned "No 4 set, point "5.3", 1520" shows men walking along corridors and lowering material through a trap door. The next clip, captioned "Cable corridor, 1530, point '5'" shows men walking along a dimly-lit corridor. In the following clip, captioned "Point '-0.75,' bubbler of the No 4 set, 1600," Pryanishnikov and other men are shown adjusting their protective clothing. A pair of legs, presumably those of Pryanishnikov, are shown protruding from the hole cut into the wall.

The program continues with a clip captioned "Skazochnyy settlement, rest base, 2100" showing a group of workers watching a "Vremya" report of the Politburo discussion of the government commission report on the causes of the Chernobyl accident. The announcer says: "Today we have succeeded in controlling the elemental force of the raging atom. But that was the atom confined to the reactor. The reactor and not warheads. That is why the leaders of our state are submitting peaceful proposals with such consistency and determination." Video shows parks and buildings in the deserted Pripyat, construction sites where new accommodation is being erected, a woman speaking in Ukrainian about her gratitude to the authorities for what has been done for the people. The program ends with miners posing for a group photograph, having completed their work on the station.

Evacuees Get Housing

PM081420 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 5 Aug 86 p 2

[Correspondent L. Virina article: "New Housing for People From Chernobyl" -- capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] Kiev Oblast -- Vladimir Ivanovich Lysak, commander of a construction workers detachment, was happy to report to people who had gathered in the square of a settlement which does not yet appear on any maps but already bears the legal name "Ternopolskiy":

"The assignment by the party and the government to build housing for the people of Chernobylskiy Rayon has been accomplished: 150 farmsteads have been built in less than 2 months."

Sofiya Borisenko, director of the House of Culture on the Iskra Kolkhoz in Ternopol Oblast's Gusyatinskiy Rayon, welcomed the settlers from Chervone Polissya Kolkhoz with a freshly baked loaf of white bread on an embroidered Ukrainian cloth. Mikhail Guta, team leader of the collective which won the socialist competition for building the new settlement, presented them with a symbolic key:

"Peace and happiness in your home!"

This resettlement took place in Kiev Oblast's Makarovskiy Rayon last Saturday. In the first days following the Chernobyl AES accident the local Gorkiy Kolkhoz welcomed the evacuees and later, like brothers, allocated them land for the settlement. The Chervone Polissya farmsteads were in Chapayevka Village. One of the streets in Ternopolskiy settlement was named Chapayevskaya as a sign that this population center has not been wiped off the face of the earth and will certainly rise again. Construction workers from Ternopol worked on that street, as well as on several others -- Gusyatinskaya, Molodezhnaya, Kiyevskaya, and Ianovetskaya.

A few minutes before G.I. Revenko, first secretary of the Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, and A.I. Korniyenko, first secretary of the Ternopol Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, cut the red ribbon on entering the village, Taras Druzhka, front-ranking clerk of works, recalled:

"I drove the first peg here on 6 June. Pouring rain, corn fields stretching as far the horizon... Virgin land as far as we construction workers were concerned, we could hardly believe that we would manage to complete six homes here by the fall, to build outbuildings, and to provide full amenities for the farmsteads. But we very much wanted to make sure that people from Chernobyl could move in their new homes as soon as possible."

Actually, their team from Monastyriska's No 14 Mobile Mechanized Column completed not six but nine farmsteads. And they were erected not in 120 days as planned, but in just 54. The homes are different from one another both architecturally and in finish. The plots also look different: dovecotes here, storks' nests there. The furniture in the homes, the light fittings, curtains, crockery, and bed linen -- gifts to people from Chernobyl from Ternopol Oblast's labor collectives -- have been chosen with love and taste, and are also different in each home. A meal was ready and waiting for the settlers on the stoves, the storerooms contained sacks with groats and all kinds of provisions, the cellars held tubs with semi-preserved vegetables. Chickens clucked in the small sheds.

Could it be that Ternopolskiy is some kind of a special settlement?

No. SEVEN THOUSAND HOMES AND 200 SOCIAL AND CULTURAL PROJECTS FOR PEOPLE FROM CHERNOBYL ARE NOW UNDER CONSTRUCTION IN KIEV OBLAST. TERNOPOLSKIY SETTLEMENT SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED ITS SETTLERS BY 1 OCTOBER, BUT IT RECEIVED THEM 2 AUGUST. MOREOVER, 148 OF THE 150 FARMSTEADS IN THE NEW POPULATION CENTER WERE RATED "EXCELLENT" ON ACCEPTANCE, AND ONLY 2 OF THEM WERE RATED "GOOD."

New settlements are awaiting their turn. In Baryshevskiy Rayon, at the other end of Kiev Oblast, E.V. Dubinin, commander of the Dnepropetrovsk construction detachment, showed us finished farmsteads in the rejuvenated Lukashi village, which has spread out in both directions -- 160 new houses have been built at one end, and 150 more at the other.

"We had heard," E.V. Dubinin said, "that people in Ternopol Oblast had wonderful architecture. This is why each one of our homes has hot and cold running water and numerous domestic appliances."

And indeed, colored tiles in bathrooms sparkled everywhere. Refrigerators and vacuum cleaners awaited the settlers. Bells rang cheerfully at the doors, mailboxes reflected the sun at the gates.

The largest production enterprises in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast sent not only construction workers but also materials and powerful equipment to Lukashi. And now the streets which have been laid in the middle of the fields carry signs: Industrialnaya, Krasnogvardeyskaya...A plaque shines on every home: "Built by Dneprovskiy Rayon's V.I. Lenin Machine Building Plant."

The sovkhoz in Lukashi -- the largest in Baryshevskiy Rayon, with over 8,000 hectares of arable land -- also bears the name of V.I. Lenin. Soon these fields will be cultivated also by crop farmers evacuated from Pripyatskiy Sovkhoz near Chernobyl. This day is being brought nearer by the two- and three-shift work being done by senior clerk of works Nikolay Afanasyev and dozens of his comrades -- concrete workers, plasterers, and decorators.

Things are also going excellently for people from Krivoy Rog, and their daily labor reports provide a yardstick for all other detachments and teams from the Dnepropetrovsk "landing party." A.I. Snezhko, commissar of the Krivoy Rog detachment, holds:

"To ensure that people feel at home, we decided to put in flower beds and lawns and to plant acacia and birch tree saplings. People from Kiev will supply them."

People from Dnepropetrovsk are fully determined: THE SECOND NEW COLLECTIVE SETTLEMENT WILL BE HANDED TO CHERNOBYLSKIY RAYON CROP FARMERS BY 10 AUGUST, CONSTRUCTION WORKERS DAY.

Working 12, 14; even more hours each day, the construction workers do not slow their pace. Much work still remains. Nikolay Afanasyev and fellow-workers from Dnepropetrovsk will complete a school for 800 pupils. Taras Druzhka will build a new kolkhoz kindergarten.

People from Chernobyl are returning to normal life. They have new concerns in their new locations, as well as many new, truly loyal, and sincere friends.

Relief Fund Grows

LD091626 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 9 TASS -- The sum of 469,468,000 roubles has been transferred to account 904, the Chernobyl Relief Fund, as of August 1, Vyacheslav Solovov, member of the board and chief accountant of the USSR State Bank, has told the IZVESTIYA newspaper.

More many was pouring in, he said in an interview published today. In July, an average of three million roubles were added to the account every day. The biggest amount was transferred between July 16 and July 23 -- 86 million roubles.

Foreign citizens, based in the USSR or in their own country, as well as Soviet people working abroad were transferring money in foreign currency. The total sum of currency receipts amounted to 1,200,000 roubles, Solovov disclosed.

Asked about the transfer of the money for the people affected, Solovov said that as soon as a juridical person was determined, entitled to carry out transactions with the money collected, the transfer proceure would follow a normal, strictly regulated order.

ZAYKOV STRESSES RESTRUCTURING IN MACHINE BUILDING

LD081954 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Text] Today a conference took place at the CPSU Central Committee at which radical enhancement of the technical level, quality, and competitiveness of machines and equipment being produced was discussed. Participating in the work of the conference were Comrades Aliyev and Zaykov, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. Comrade Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; Comrades Biryukova, Zimyanin, Medvedev, Nikonov, Razumovskiy, and Yakovlev, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Kapitonov, chairman of Central Auditing Commission of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Comrades Antonov, Maslyukov, Marchuk and Silayev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers; and Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The conference was opend by Comrade Zaykov. Comrades Maslyukov and Silayev delivered reports.

Speeches were made at the conference by (Mirzoyev), chief designer of the Volag vehicles works; (Novozhilov), general designer of the Ilyushin design office; a number of other managers of technological services of enterprises and organizations; Comrades Kolesnikov, Kolpakov, and Lamayev, USSR ministers; Comrade Kolmogorov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Standards; Comrade Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Kamenev, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology Frolov; Comrade Pogrebnyak, secretary of the Ukraine Communist Party Central Committee; Comrade Lepeshkin, secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; and others.

Summing up the results of the conference, Comrade Zaykov noted the business-like, frank, and exceptionally useful discussion on the cardinal paths to accelerate scientific and technical progress in the base branch of industry -- machine building. Right now, resolving tasks which differ fundamentally from those that were set in previous 5-year plans is foreseen. In practice, we have to achieve in the 5-year plan what was previously accomplished over three or four. It is essential for machine builders to attain basic output parameters of the highest world standard in just a few years. This is revolutionary task the likes of which has not been seen in practice.

Comrade Zaykov noted that the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government have given the machine-building complex absolutely everything that our economy can permit. Modern electronics and computer technology are at the core of technical renewal and raising the effectiveness of new developments. Comrade Zaykov named a number of plants where efficient and competent use is being made of new technology, and said that these should become testing grounds of front-ranking experience of all machine builders.

Comrade Zaykov dewelled in detail on these issues upon which raising the quality of output depends. He pointed out that the problems of technical standard, quality, and materials input of equipment being manfactured are indissolubly linked to the development of the scientific and production base of machine building itself. The production apparatus of the machine-building complex must be completely renewed within a short period of time.

Pointing out that the main weakness of the industry's science lies today in the fact that it is cut off from production, Comrade Zaykov said the most effective way to enhance the role of the industry's scientific research institutions and design departments is to set up, on the basis of these, large-scale scientific production associations.

A great deal of attention was given in the speech of the problem of automating scientific research institutions and design departments. Questions on enhancing the creative performance of scientific staff, designers, and technologists were singled out in particular. Comrade Zaykov pointed out that virtually all the ministry's demands in regard to improving the material incentives for the labor of designers and technologists have been met. However, for the moment the transfer of scientific organizations to the new conditions of work is being poorly carried out.

Comrade Zaykov underlined that scientifc workers, designers, and technologists should play a great role in realizing the comprehensive program of scientific and technical progress of the CEMA countries up to the year 2000. The experience of setting up joint enterprises with the fraternal socialist countries is yielding good results. Effective forms of mutually benefiticial economic cooperation with the capitalist countries as well should be energetically sought.

Comrade Zaykov also dewelled on the output of consumer goods by machine-building enterprises. He also pointed out that the attitude of economic planners to the working and living conditions of machine builders must be altered.

A great deal of attention was devoted to matters relating to the training, selection, and distribution of cadres. Addressing the party workers taking part in the conference, Comrade Zaykov proposed the tasks of monitoring the execution of decisions adopted and of developing an atmosphere of creative mettle in every collective. The party Central Committee, he noted, counts on having the results of the conference serve as an additional stimulus to work on accelerated develoomment of science and technology.

Further Report on Speech

LD082121 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Aug 86

[Excerpts] Today a conference took place at the CPSU Central Committee at which questions of radically enhancing the technical level, quality and competitiveness of machines and equipment being produced were discussed. [passage omitted]

Summing up the results of the conference, Comrade Zaykov noted that a businesslike, frank and exceptionally useful discussion took place on the fundamental ways of accelerating scientific and technical progress in machine-building, a basic industry. In the light of the demands of the 27th CPSU Congress, the state of affairs is to be changed radically with the wide implementation of scientific and technical achievements, and of new methods of economic management and leadership. There is a great deal of work to be done. In just a few years, no less than six or seven machine-builders must bring their basic output up to the highest world standards. In one 5-year period we must in practice do what previously took three or four.

As the first results of the postcongress work show, the process acceleration has been stepped up in the country, as has the transfer of the economy toward intensification. But restructuring it still being carried out slowly, as was pointed out at the June 1986 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. It has not yet really affected all labor collectives. but there has been no perceptible changes for the better with regard to improving output quality; irregular working at enterprises; and the rate at which technical reequipment of production is being carried out.

In machine-building as a whole, the state plan target for development of science and technology has not been fulfilled. It is essential that there should be in every ministry a precise and scientically-based long-term prognosis in every section for the development of all types of technology, and that this should be used as a guide in drawing up 5-year plans for creation of new types of articles, Comrade Zaykov commented.

Modern electronics and computer technology are at the core of technical renewal and of raising the effectiveness of new developments. However, at many enterprises, automated systems of production control are chiefly used in the information mode, to carry out bookkeeping and other simple calculations. Many problems are also cropping up in the process of robotization of production. All in all, quite a few robots are manufactured in the country; However, the overwhelming majority of them are primitive models.

Comrade Zaykov then dwelled in detail on the issues on which raising the quality of output depends. He stressed that the problem of quality can be resolved only if there is restructuring at all stages, from design to introduction. Securing a high level of discipline and order at every enterprise and at every work place is an indispensable condition in the struggle to realize the party line on improving quality everywhere. It is essential to develop production processes which are as economic as possible. Metal is the bread of industry, our national wealth, and one must be especially thrifty with it.

The problems of the technical standards, quality and materials input of equipment being manufactured are indissolubly linked to the development of scientific and production base of machine-building itself, and the chief role here belongs to machine-tool building. But one should not rule out other ways of raising production efficiency, either. First and foremost, better use must be made of existing modern equipment, its rate of utilization per shift must be increased, and active efforts to modernize the machine tool stock should be made.

It was pointed out that in the section on the industry's science that its main weakness today is the fact that it is cut off from production. A great deal of attention was also given in the speech to the problem of automating scientific research institutions and design bureaus.

Addressing the party workers, Comrade Zaykov posed for them the task of monitoring execution of decisions adopted, and of creating an atmosphere of creative mettle in every collective -- this, he said, is a priority task of party organizations. [passage omitted]

MANAGERS CRITICIZED AT MARITIME KRAYKOM PLENUM

LD091339 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 9 Aug 86

[Text] A plenum of the Maritime Kraykom was held today in Vladivostok. A report on the tasks of the kray party organization in the light of the decisions of the July 1986 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and of the recommendations made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at his speech at the festive meeting for the presentation of the Order of Lenin to Vladivostok was delivered by Comrade Gayarov, Kraykom first secretary.

The participants of the plenum were unanimous in their desire to move from the decrease in the growth rates that had become a feature of the economy of the region in recent times, to their acceleration; from the preponderance of extensive factors to an intensification of the economy by all available means. Reserves were named in all branches of industry.

There was strong criticism of managers and collectives for adopting a formal and superficial attitude to reconstruction. The plenum made it incumbent on the Maritime Kray Communists to ensure practical implementation of the party's plans for turning the kray into a highly efficient economic complex with its own major scientific-production base, optimal structure of the economy, and advanced social and cultural sphere.

It is necessary to draw up and set about implementing a territorial industrial program for intensification of the economy of the kray in the 12th 5-Year Plan and for the period up to the year 2000. It was decided to double the volume of industrial production by then.

MINISTRIES ASSAILED FOR RESISTING NEW METHODS

PM101432 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Aug 86 First Edition p 1

["Editor's Opinion" by V. Shilov, editor in the newspaper's industry, transport, and construction department: "Ministry and Reorganization"]

[Text] The reorganization in the upper echelons of economic management is assuming an increasingly wide scale and depth. The planning system and the economic machinery are being fundamentally modernized. Sectorial structures are being transformed. The methods and style of managerial activity are being improved. In all this complex and urgent work an important role is allocated to leaders and to the apparatus of ministries and departments. How, then, are the sector headquarters resolving the tasks of reorganization?

The State Agro-Industrial Committee's very first steps have significantly improved coordination and collaboration in the work of partners in the agrarian-industrial complex, although relapses into the old departmentalism still make themselves known. The collegium of the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building headed by V.M. Lukyanenko, the new minister, is energetically transferring the entire sector to full economic autonomous financing. The Ministry of Railways is actively introducing the experience of Moscow and Belorussian railroad workers -- which is making it possible to enhance the efficiency of the work of the entire transport network. The time has come when the large-scale economic experiments, being tested and adjusted within the framework of individual production associations and then in entire sectors, are becoming a statewide system of management. The reorganization has been initiated. However, this process is taking place with interruptions and distortions, old approaches are dragging it back, and inertia is still strong. This is why we must on no account be seduced by what has been achieved but carry out the reorganization with still greater energy and rid ourselves of all that is obsolete.

The habit of doing things just for show, when managerial efforts are aimed not at improving work but at making a good report, should probably be named as one of the chief retarding factors. This trend has been manifested particularly clearly at the RSFSR Fish Industry Ministry. To judge from statistical reports, things are going brilliantly in the sector: The 6-month plan was fulfilled by 108 percent. Why, then, is such shock work not noticeable on the fish counters? The point is that the Fish Industry Ministry's leaders planned to produce less marketable output than last year's level, and the enterprises easily exceeded the understated targets. It should be remarked that it still remains a profitable exercise to pass off easy work as good work. During the first quarter alone an additional sum of approximately R3 million was paid into the incentive funds of RSFSR Fish Industry Minister enterprises. If bonuses are given for bad work, who will work well? During the winter and spring period the Ministries of Motor Transport, the Textile Industry, and Trade and a number of other sectors worked to understated plans. Dizziness from imaginary successes is an insidious thing. Having reported a successful start to the new 5-year plan, many ministries and departments failed to meet the monthly target in June, slowing down the growth rate for the entire national economy.

The question of the RSFSR Gosplan's responsibility cannot be passed over in silence. When examining the draft plans, was it really impossible to foresee the consequences of the obviously flawed method of putting off for tomorrow what must be done today? This approach leads to statistical distortion of the real state of affairs, to rushed work and storm tactics, to striving for percentages at any price. In principle, such a practice is nothing but a kind of deception. A semblance of well-being disorients, belittles the responsibility of economic cadres, and demobilizes labor collectives -- it slows down the process of reorganization from top to bottom.

No less harm is caused to the business of acceleration by a kind of "semireorganization," when half-measures are taken instead of vigorous and decisive action. This half-heartedness is particularly characteristic of the ministries' investment policy. It continues to be dictated by the economic expenditure mechanism, which fostered the mentality of wasteful dependence, when all sectorial strategy amounts to one thing. How to secure more state funds. Under these conditions ministries and departments are not particularly inclined to count public rubles or to strive for a quick return on capital investments. As is known, normative construction times are being introduced next year. Funding for long-term construction projects will simply be stopped. The leaders of sector headquarters have proved psychologically unprepared to work without long-term construction projects. Thus, the Ministries of Motor Transport, Local Industry, the Fuel Industry, Trade, and the River Fleet are refusing to mothball approximately 30 long-term construction projects with low technical readiness. At the same time, it is proposed to include more than 100 new construction projects in next year's plans.

It is frequently planned to construct new projects according to obsolete plans. For this reason a considerable amount of technical planning documentation was returned for revision. A selective check on 90 projects revealed that many ministries and departments took a formal attitude to a repeat revision, preserving in them obsolete equipment which had been taken out of production, inefficient designs, and backward technology. At the same time, not one sector headquarters made it its aim to increase enterprises' capacity by using more sophisticated equipment. Next year enterprises in practically all sectors will begin modernizing, using their own production development funds and bank credits. They will have to live on earned funds alone. The expenditure mentality of department and association leaders can have pernicious consequences for the financially autonomous activity of labor collectives.

Another extremely alarming circumstance: Contract ministries are virtually not reorganizing their work with regard to the increasing social thrust of our investment policy. Thus, whereas the pace of commissioning basic production projects has increased 15 percent, the commissioning of apartment blocks has increased just 3 percent. An extraordinary situation is taking shape on social projects. During the 6 months the annual targets for commissioning hospitals, polyclinics, preschool establishments, general educational schools, and vocational and technical schools were fulfilled by just 9-30 percent. The USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction and the Ministry of Construction in the Far East and Transbaykal Regions are particularly scornful toward projects of this kind. The deadlines for commissioning many projects in the social sphere have still not been agreed upon between the clients and the contractors. You get the impression that the leaders of the sector headquarters have not assimilated the 27th CPSU Congress decisions or adopted them for execution.

Work is now being done to improve the organizational structures of national economic management, and the general schemes of management are being revised. It is proposed to abolish a further 69 republic associations and a number of other organizations. The apparatus in 16 ministries will be cut by 2,600 different posts. However, this work is proceeding unevenly and sometimes comes up against direct opposition from the ministries' leaders. For example, the leaders of the RSFSR Light Industry Ministry tried to reduce the reorganization of the central apparatus chiefly to redesignating administrations, and departments as administrations.

The number of workers in the central apparatus is being reduced unwillingly. The RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium, for example, has sharply criticized the management scheme submitted by the Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services, above all because it is oriented toward maintaining and even increasing the size of the managerial apparatus. [paragraph continues]

How did Minister V. I. Popov react to this? Some time later he again submitted to the government the selfsame document, slightly reedited, without altering the fundamental approach to the question. The redistribution of rights and duties between the central apparatus and the local organs is proceeding in a very complex manner. Sometimes the matter approaches absurdity. Thus, the USSR Light Industry Ministry suddenly demanded that the production of felt footwear, china, and earthenware products, and even toys, be switched from republic to union subordination. This is a typical example of a bureaucratic approach to reorganization. It is not such an exceptional example incidentally.

The desire to manage everything from the center, without making a proper study of the state of affairs locally or consulting with labor collectives, remains one of the weakest spots in the work of the ministries' apparatus. Here is a characteristic example. Fuel Industry Minister V. G. Arkhipov reported to the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium that reorganization was proceeding successfully in the sector. This is roughly how things looked: The volume of marketable output had increased 9 percent over last year. The pace set at the start is even now almost 3 times in excess of that planned for the 5-year plan. It is tempting, of course, to ascribe this acceleration to reorganization. But it is far more useful to admit that, in drawing up the plans, the sector headquarters did not take the sector's great reserves into consideration. Given this approach, you have to speak not of labor successes but of serious strategic blunders by the Fuel Industry Ministry. And they are not accidental.

An analysis of the Fuel Industry Ministry's activity revealed that there are still no substantial changes in the style and methods of the ministry apparatus. Just as before, the chief occupation of the sector headquarters workers is preparing various kinds of information and drawing up outgoing papers. During the first 4 months alone approximately 2,500 letters, instructions, and orders were sent to 37,000 addresses. It is really not the headquarters of an industrial sector but an administrative-publishing department! The apparatus specialists employed on bureaucratic paperwork seldom visit enterprises and have little knowledge of the real state of affairs. Hence blunders in planning, the disorderly purchase of unnecessary equipment worth many millions of rubles, and the bad dissemination of progressive collectives' experience. The very style of management does not demand creativity and responsibility of the sector headquarters workers. It is no coincidence that 36 percent of the engineering and technical specialists in the ministry's central apparatus do not have higher education. Hence the incompetent management.

The example of the Fuel Industry Ministry is probably characteristic in many ways of other sector headquarters. There are still many people in ministry apparatuses who are not marching in step with reorganization. Some doubt, others observe, and yet others bide their time. The force of habit is strong: Let the Gosplan plan, the Gosbank give the money, and the Gossnab provide the resources, and then we will act. Having grown accustomed to such dependence, certain ministry workers have misgivings about the policy of independence: "Better without rights, and without responsibility too." Many leaders explan the lead-in to reorganization like this: The new management conditions are being introduced on a statewide scale only next year, and we will be able to reorganize ourselves then. It is impossible to agree with this position. Will we still be working in the old way on 31 December but in the new way on 1 January? Impossible. The turn to the new way has already begun, and there is no reverse gear. It is not permissible to tarry, still less to be inactive, in such a situation. It is important not to stop half way but to pick up speed.